CONTENTS

Editorial Notes 101
Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.

The Newly Proposed Translation of Genesis 2:5-6 106
Rev. W. H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.L.

Witness of the Early Church to the Authorship of the Gospels 115
Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.

The Eschatological Discourse 125
Rev. A. C. Cotter, S.J.

The Urim and Thummim 133
Rev. E. A. Mangan, C.Ss.R., S.S.L.

The Professors of Scripture and the Discussion Study Club 139
Rev. J. F. Rowan, S.T.D., S.S.L.

A Recent Life of Christ 145
Very Rev. C. J. Callan, O.P., S.T.M.

Obscurities in the Latin Psalter 150
Rev. W. H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.L.

The Archæology of the Crucifixion 154
Rev. J. J. Collins, S.J., S.S.L.

Difficulties in Translating St. John's Gospel 160
Rev. W. L. Newton, S.S.D.

"Fidelis, Faithful" 163
Rev. L. P. Foley, C.M., S.T.D.

Archæological Corner 166
Rev. E. A. Cerny, S.S., S.T.D.

Biblical News 169
Rev. C. H. Pickar, O.S.A., S.S.L.

The Association's Membership Roll 171

Book Reviews 183

The World's Classic, Job, George O'Neill, S.J. EDWARD J. BYRNE

The Whole Christ, Emile Mersch. EDWARD A. MANGAN, C.Ss.R.

Witnesses to Christ, Most Revernd Alban Goodier, S.J. CHARLES G. HEMPLER, O.M.CAP.

Maps of the Land of Christ, E. Seraphin, O.F.M. and J. Kelly, O.F.M. M. J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

Historical Atlas of the Holy Land. M. J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

The New Testament, Westminster Version, Joseph Dean. CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

The Salvation of Nations, H. Franke. JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

Once—In Palestine, Lucille Papin Borden. CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/catholic-biblical-quarterly_1939-04_1_2

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Catholic Biblical Association of America shares in the mourning of the whole Church over the death of Pius XI. Its aims received his approval and blessing, and they are clearly in agreement with those he had manifested, particularly in his last years, in regard to Bible studies. He shared in the solicitude of Pius X and Benedict XV lest the deposit of the faith regarding the inspiration and the interpretation of the Sacred Books be sacrificed by destructive criticism; but he strongly urged the cultivation of the Biblical sciences. He would have Catholics endeavor to bring out more clearly, in the light of modern scholarship, the truth contained in the Scriptures. One of the things he was most preoccupied about at the end of his life was the better organization of seminaries; on the death of Cardinal Bisleti, he took over himself the direction of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, and he showed special interest in the development of Scripture study. The Rev. Dr. Newton told in our January number of a meeting at Rome in which he exhorted biblical students to work hard in the criticism of the text. They are not to be satisfied with past achievements, he said, while there remain so many things to be done: *Nil actum si quid agendum.* We may be sure that nothing will add more to the "accidental happiness" in heaven of the great worker who has now gone to his rest than the improvement of our Biblical Quarterly, the turning out of a good translation and commentary of the Bible, and the doing of the other things we have planned in view of making God's written word better understood.

The Papal blessing of the Catholic Biblical Association of America was conveyed to us by Eugenio Cardinal Pacelli, now gloriously reigning as Pope Pius XII, in a letter of August 22, 1938. The Cardinal said that the Holy Father was thanking God for the graces and favors so far received by us and imploring that the Holy Ghost might descend to enlighten the minds and enlarge love in the hearts of those whose honor and privilege it is to investigate and propagate the holy word of God. "Having spoken for the Sovereign Pontiff," he said at the end of the letter, "may I add my own congratulations and feelings of esteem."

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

How many gracious letters of this kind have gone forth to congresses, societies, individuals within the last ten years! They have been most understanding and sympathetic. It was clear that the Holy Father's secretary was a well informed gentleman, appreciative, and kind. He has, indeed, the innate tact of Roman diplomacy combined with a priestly spirit.

Our Holy Father belongs to a family which has served the Church with distinction. His great-grandfather was minister of finance under Gregory XVI. His grandfather was the last minister of foreign affairs under Pius IX. His father was a counsellor of Leo XIII and Pius X. His brother, a great lawyer, had an important part in arranging the Vatican Pact. He himself, having devoted himself to God in the priesthood, entered as *minutante* (redactor) into the Sacred Congregation of Ecclesiastical Affairs, of which he became Secretary in 1912. Here he served and trained under Cardinals Rampolla, Merry del Val and Gasparri. In order to co-operate in the new Code of Canon Law he refused, with regret, the chair of Canon Law in the Catholic University of America. He is, then, an eminent jurist and a diplomat. He can attend to a multitude of affairs and very much work without hurry or confusion, and he conveys the impression that he and his time belong entirely to the man he is talking with or writing to.

On big occasions, when he has been legate *a latere* of the Pope, as at Lourdes, Lisieux, Buenos Aires, Budapest, he has aroused universal admiration by his understanding and his eloquence. But what is more important, his powers of an orator are all used solely in the interest of religion. He is ever the devout priest, a lover of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament and of Our Lady. Already his talents and the character had made a great impression on the mind of Catholics all over the world when the Cardinals gathered in conclave to choose a successor to Pius XI. His election rejoiced the hearts of the faithful; they have given him their love spontaneously. We join in this acclamation of loyal devotion, praying that our Association, by its achievements as well as by its aims, may ever be worthy of his blessing.

In the January number of the Hibbert Journal, M. Paul-Louis Couchoud pays a significant tribute of praise to two Catholic exegetes now gone to their reward, Father de Grandmaison, S.J., and Father Lagrange, O.P. He says:

"Catholic criticism has produced fine work which I admire. The *Jésus-Christ* of Père de Grandmaison, the four commentaries on the Gospels of Père Lagrange are works of honest and solid scholarship. Their learning is evident and well controlled; the philology sound; controversy dignified and calm. We walk on ground that is firm under the foot. The Gospel texts are taken as meaning what they say. There is no discordance between their plain sense and the explanation offered, and nothing is superimposed. We recognize at once that the faith which the words express and the faith which comments on the words are one and the same. They remind me of noble gentlemen doing the honor of some ancient family house. They introduce me by the great gate, show me the distribution of the parts and explain the reason of it all. With the independent critics, on the other hand, I feel that I am breaking into the house; they show me a chaos and pretend to reconstruct the plan."

Father Lagrange might see in this tribute the beginning of the fulfillment of a prophecy contained in his work, *Le Sens du Christianisme*, 1918 (p. xii):

"The Catholic Church has preserved faithfully the ancient dogmatic interpretation, and it will be recognized more and more that this interpretation is irreproachable before the tribunal of reason. Its success is due before all else no doubt to the assistance which Jesus Christ has promised to His apostles. It represents also the advantages of well-tested tradition over the flights of individual reason however vigorous they might be."

We have often followed with interest the work of exegetes independent of the authority of the Catholic Church as they rediscovered in the Bible meanings which Catholics have seen right along; but this is perhaps the first time that an unbeliever has recognized the truth of the Gospel interpretation of such representative Catholic exegetes as Father de Grandmaison and Father Lagrange. For M. Couchoud, as he confesses with apparent regret, has not the faith.

He has, however, broken with the rationalistic theory that the historic Jesus was merely a man who evolved into a God in the

faith of His followers: "Twenty years devoted to the study of the ancient Christian texts," he says, "have convinced me that the present faith of Catholics, when reduced to its bare and simple substance, is identical with the primitive faith. There is not a single text of primitive Christianity which, when taken in its true sense, does not presuppose belief in the God-man.... Apart from this belief Christianity is non-existent. By means of it we can effect the radical separation of a Jewish text from a Christian text.... Vain to represent it as gradually arising by an interior evolution of Christianity....This progression is pure hypothesis. We have nothing older than the Epistles of Paul where the doctrine of a God-man is already complete and well balanced. What stages of progression, then, are imaginable?"

M. Couchoud is right in rejecting the theory of the "Apotheosis of Jesus" but he is wrong in proposing a still more impossible theory, that the Jesus adored as God by the early Christians had no human existence. It would have been Marcion, around A. D. 140, who invested the God Jesus with human nature and thus made him the God-man of the New Testament.

But, we ask, what about the Gospels, which are well attested documents of the first century, written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John? In his elation over his new hypothesis, M. Couchoud seems to neglect the evidence which we propose elsewhere in this issue of the Catholic Biblical Quarterly and proposes a theory to which M. Loisy does justice in the Hibbert Journal for 1937-38 in two articles entitled "Was Jesus an Historical Person?"

That Our Lord was an historical person seemed so clear to Father Lagrange and Father de Grandmaison that they did not pay any attention to the few erratic exegetes who, before M. Couchoud, had denied His existence here on earth. The documents concerning His life, no matter what rationalists might retrench or add or modify in them, seemed to these scholars to tell of a real human life so very clearly that it required no debate. M. Couchoud puts forward a view concerning those documents which would seem inconceivable to Catholics; M. Loisy considers it fantastic. The earliest Gospel, according to M. Couchoud, would be Marcion's. St. Luke's Gospel, which Marcion has hitherto been accused of mutilating, would be dependent on Marcion. It would have introduced what Marcion had for the first time taught about an earthly career of the God Jesus. The

authors of the Gospels assigned Matthew, Mark, and John would have done the same in different parts of the world. The Epistles of St. Paul, M. Couchoud thinks, may be partly authentic and may be interpreted as referring to one who was God, not man. The Apocalypse of John (the real John of Jerusalem), "the only Christian document to be assigned with certainty to the first century," would offer some texts to support his new representation of Our Lord.

"Is the God-man Jesus a man made into a God or a God made into a Man? For believers—that is for the immense majority of those interested in the truth about Jesus—the alternative of a process, either from man to God or from God to man, does not exist. To propose it, for them, is a scandal," says M. Couchoud.

It is not likely that his proposition will scandalize anybody. No one will fall for his theory, even those who regard the ordinary rationalistic theories as most untenable. And since we are indulging in prophecy, we venture to predict that the more rationalists study early Christian literature the more clearly they will see not only that the Catholic Church interprets it correctly but see, as did Harnack, that the traditional chronology of this literature is based on good evidence and that there is not sufficient time between the events which came to pass among us when the Word was made flesh and the narratives of those events, to admit of the evolutions which they have conjectured.

We have in this issue an article on the testimony of the Church of around A. D. 200 and its implications regarding the tradition of earlier times. This testimony furnishes ground for certitude that our Gospels came from the Evangelists to whom tradition has assigned them. One day after I had been putting the argument based upon it before the seminarians of my Scripture class at St. Mary's, I tried it out on a professor of history whose judgment has always seemed to me almost infallible. He listened carefully and then asked, "And the rationalists will not agree that this evidence is decisive?" Thinking of rationalists in general I said, "No." "Well," he exclaimed, "the sons of Belial!" We shall doubtless have occasion to confirm the witness of St. Irenaeus and his contemporaries by the study of earlier writers, but it really needs no confirmation.

W. S. R.

THE NEWLY PROPOSED TRANSLATION OF GENESIS 2:5-6

The Book of Genesis opens with a formal account of the divine creation of all things known to man. This concludes with chapter 2, verse 3. In 2:4 begins, with an appropriate heading, the history of man as a moral and religious being. That type of biblical criticism which rests its case with first impressions, has succeeded in popularizing the shallow persuasion that these two sections of Genesis present two conflicting traditions of the origin of the world. On the contrary, Gen. 2:4-25 does not even allude to such familiar things as the sun, the moon, the stars, the sea, or any creature of the waters. That the original sources of the two sections were distinct seems evident enough, but distinction is not opposition. That 2:4 takes up a new topic the redactor himself indicates by marking it with the first of his ten stereotyped subtitles, "These are the offspring of heaven and earth when they were created." The aim is no longer to declare the origin of all things known to the ancients. The manner of the world's beginning has been told; now for the history of its first and most significant issues.

This is not assuming that the narrative which now begins had originally taken shape with the wording of the hexaëmeron in view and with a conscious purpose of fitting into it at certain points. No such assumption is necessary. As Heinisch observes,[1] the author knew his readers to be already familiar with accounts of the beginning of the world. In incorporating this first cycle of *toledoth*—called those "of heaven and earth" as following close upon the finished universe, but having no human head and source to lend his name—the redactor himself did not view it as aiming to account for the world at large. This theme he had already covered by reproducing that most ancient of memory-lessons, the formula of the six days of creative labor followed by the divine sabbath. This done, the moral career of man becomes his sole concern. Even where "the earth" is mentioned, the conditions described are not necessarily worldwide. The tradition has centered its attention upon that part of the earth which was the scene of the earliest human drama. The origin of the historic human race is clearly enough in view, but not that of

[1] *Das Buch Genesis*, 1930, p. 112.

other things in general. The adjective "all," as applied to edible fruits, wild animals, and birds,[2] is not more strictly universal than our own popular expression "all sorts of"; and these three classes of creatures, the only ones mentioned, make their appearance for man's sake. The whole relates to man and revolves about his destiny. In what is called "the East" there was a region known as "Eden"; there "the man" and "his woman" were settled and provided for; their food was furnished by a providential "garden" or "park," and bird and beast were their subjects, assigned to that status from very origin. That plants and animals in general came later than men, the tradition is not concerned to affirm. The whole relation of man to his environment is so clearly one of worth and purpose, rather than of mere order in time, that the redactor himself can affix this record immediately to that of the six days without discerning any root of discrepancy between them.

"These are the offspring of heaven and earth when they were created." With this subtitle the author assumes the conventional narrative style of the book as a whole. But, simply and clearly as the story proceeds when once in motion, it seems to halt a little in starting. An early root of obscurity was the Septuagint's idea, perpetuated by the Vulgate, that טֶרֶם יִהְיֶה בָאָרֶץ meant "before it existed on earth"—which it could not mean in Hebrew—and the consequent paradox: "In the day that the Lord God made the heaven and the earth: and every plant of the field before it sprung up in the earth, and every herb of the ground before it grew."[3] However, to translate more correctly from the Massoretic text, "No plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field had yet sprouted,"[4] leaves us confronted with further questions. There is a temporal protasis ("in the day," etc.) in verse 4, since this clause can hardly be a needless repetition of the preceding infinitive phrase "in their creation" and an encumbrance to the conventional title besides. But where are we to place its apodosis, the principal statement of the context? Three times, including verse 7, occurs the elusive *wau*, which may introduce an apodosis, as our colloquial "then" is apt to do after a prolonged designation of time or circumstance.

[2] Gen. 2:9,19.
[3] Challoner, 1750, *et al.*
[4] English Revised Version, 1885.

Among those modern commentators who find the apodosis in verse 7—"Then Yahweh Elohim formed the man," etc.—are Bertholet, Kautzsch, Dillmann, Gunkel, Procksch, Bea, and apparently Hoberg and Hummelauer. But as verses 5 and 6 thus become a lengthy and awkward parenthesis between the protasis in 4 and this apodosis, we prefer the more natural division adopted by Calmet, Lamy, Driver, Spurrell, Moffat, Meek, Skinner, and Heinisch, who find the apodosis in 5, immediately after the temporal clause in 4b. Tentatively, then, one would translate 4-6 as follows:

At the time when Yahweh, (who is) God, made the earth and the heavens, no shrub of the wild yet existed in the earth, and no herb of the wild[5] was yet sprouting, for Yahweh, (who is) God, had not made it rain on the earth, and there was not a man to work the soil. But a mist used to rise from the earth, and it watered all the surface of the soil.

The common explanation of this rendering concedes that the last sentence must denote a change in the former state of things. If vegetation had not yet appeared for lack of moisture at the time which the record takes as its point of departure, it would be contradictory to say that anything sufficed to "water all the surface of the soil" at the same time, unless, indeed, there was too much water. A Lapide and Heinisch suppose that the waters of "the abyss" had not yet receded from the submerged earth. Since the latter view has few supporters, and would normally demand other language in the Hebrew, one must reject the notion of land submerged by the primeval sea, and understand soil sufficiently moistened with water from some atmospheric or terrestrial source. The majority of modern exegetes thus interpret the words. They see in verse 5 a description of land as yet devoid of plants because without rain, at least in sufficient abundance. Man, whose proper occupation would be agriculture, was also yet to come. In verse 6 the first obstacle is said to have been removed at some later time by the agency which "watered all the surface of the soil." Man can now be introduced, in verse 7, to take up his occupation.

But the application of 6 to a later time than that of 5 seems difficult to some exegetes. If 6 relates a new phenomenon by which drought was changed to moisture, one would expect its verb to stand first in the usual consecutive construction. In-

[5] Heb. in both cases, "of the open," as of land unoccupied and unenclosed.

stead, the subject precedes, and the verb follows in the imperfect without a conjunction. This, we are told, should indicate an enduring situation, and therefore one contemporary with the state of drought described in 5. It is to avoid this apparent contradiction (industriously capitalized by certain radical critics) that a different rendering of 5-6 is now proposed and defended on grammatical grounds.

While the whole argument has been developed by Sachsse,[6] it is taken over, with due acknowledgment, by a more accessible defender, Fr. Augustin Bea, S. J., of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, in his treatise *De Pentateucho*,[7] a part of the well known but as yet incomplete *Institutiones Biblicae*. The same translation of verse 6 has been partly espoused by the Rev. W. Leonard, in the *Australasian Catholic Record*.[8] Bea differs in three points from the common modern interpretation. He finds in אֵד, usually rendered "mist" or "vapor," a loan-word of Sumerian origin equivalent to "canal-stream." He also makes this noun not the subject of יַעֲלֶה in qal, but the direct object of the same form construed as hif'il. Thirdly, he regards both this imperfect and also the perfect consecutive, "watered," as verbs of two final clauses correlative with the previous infinitive clause ("to work," etc.), in keeping with a well known feature of Hebrew style. From this results the following translation:[9]

> At the time when Yahweh Elohim made earth and heaven—now, no shrub of the field was yet in the earth, and no herb of the field was yet sprouting, for Yahweh Elohim had not made it rain on the earth, and there was not a man to work the soil, or to bring up a canal-stream from the earth and water all the surface of the soil,—then Yahweh Elohim formed the man, etc.

As regards the self-consistency of the history, this proposal seems to avoid Scylla only to fall upon Charybdis. Whatever in point of extent is meant by "the earth," it is now left devoid of moisture from any source whatever at the very time of man's creation, which Bea makes the apodosis of 4b. But we prefer to discuss the proposed translation on the more objective ground of language and style.

[6] *Der jahwistische Schöpfungsbericht*, *ZAW* 39, 3/4 (1921), pp. 276-283
[7] 2d ed. 1933, pp. 147 ff.
[8] XI, 3, July, 1934, pp. 195-212.
[9] Originally in Latin and metrically arranged: Bea, *loc. cit.*

Before doing so, however, a word is due to one feature of Leonard's interpretation. He accepts Bea's meaning for אֵד, but would leave it as subject of יַעֲלֶה in qal, and extend to this verb the negation expressed by אֵין in the preceding clause. Thus: ". . .man was not there to work the soil, nor did any stream go up from the earth and water the whole face of the soil."[10] As Leonard and others observe, this suggestion goes back to Saadyah. It is ascribed to "some Jews" and some who had followed them, by Mariana and Malvenda, of whom the latter rejects it. It finds a later adherent in Calmet, who vainly tries to justify it by two false parallels,[11] and it is expressly rejected by Houbigant[12] and Rosenmüller.[13] It does more credit to Saadyah's ingenuity than to his better judgment of Hebrew syntax. The negative verbal אֵין of the first clause cannot be extended to supply the place of the particle לֹא required for the negation of the finite verb of the second clause. The proposal calls for no serious discussion, and Bea's rendering may now be considered in detail.

First, as to the meaning of אֵד. The word occurs only here and in Job, 36:27, where it is associated with rain, but too obscurely to afford us much light. The ancient versions of Genesis show their authors uncertain of the meaning of אֵד, as Bea and Heinisch observe. Πηγή in the LXX, *fons* in the Vulgate, *mabbû'ā* in the Pesîttā, and ἐπιβλυσμός in Aquila, all amount to "spring" or "fount," for which, however, one would expect עַיִן in the Hebrew. On the other hand, the Samaritan Targum and the Aramaic Targum of Onqelos understand "a cloud," as of mist or vapor. Passing over now to the 17th century, and tracing to our own times only such versions, commentaries, lexicons, and grammars as deal directly with Hebrew, we find five distinct ideas attaching to אֵד.

One of these, "a flood" as denoting original inundation by the primeval sea, is preferred by à Lapide and (apparently) Heinisch, but by few if any besides. Another rendering, the oldest of all, we have seen in the "spring" or "fount" of four early ver-

[10] *Loc. cit.* p. 209.
[11] *In Genesim*, 1739.
[12] *In Vet. Test.* I, 1777.
[13] *Scholia in Genesim*, 1821.

sions, to which Gordon adheres. The third meaning, "mist" or "vapor," besides the Samaritan and Aramaic Targums, is adopted by the Authorized and Revised Versions, that of the Jewish Publication Society, those of Moffat and Meek in English, and of Fillion and Crampon in French; by the commentators Mariana, Malvenda, Calmet, Houbigant, Rosenmüller, Lamy, Delitzsch, Hummelauer, Dillmann, Hoberg, Driver, Spurrell, Procksch, Murillo, Hetzenauer, and Eduard König; also in the latter's Hebrew lexicon, in that of Brown, Driver, and Briggs, and in Cowley's grammar.

A fourth meaning appears probably in the German versions of Bertholet and Kautzsch, and certainly in the commentaries of Gunkel and Skinner, and in Buhl's lexicon.[14] These take אֵד as derived from Assyrian *edû*, "a flood" understood as the overflow of a river, and here as recurrent if not periodical.[15] But recent developments tend to associate this meaning in effect with the fifth and last one, that of "canal-water," at least in so far as the Assyrian *edû* is in turn referred by some to a Sumerian original.[16] As to this last, Deimel,[17] Sachsse,[18] and Johann Theis[19] find it either in the Sumerian *íd*, "canal," or in its cognate *a-dê-a*, "irrigation." This is the derivation and meaning adopted by Bea.

As regards etymology, it is noteworthy that König[20] rejects the origin *edû* and prefers an Arabic connection for אֵד as "mist." But one cannot decide with certainty between these opinions. Only one point need be made. Since Bea's rendering of יַעֲלֶה as "bring up" is intelligible only of artificial irrigation, and not applicable even to the Assyrian *edû* as the natural overflow of a river, it is clear that the Sumerian meaning "canal-stream" for אֵד is vital to his proposed rendering of verse 6. On the other hand, if יַעֲלֶה remains a predicate in qal, either "spring," "mist," or "river-flood" can make sense as its subject. The new translation has a heavy burden of proof to sustain.

[14] *17 Auflage.*

[15] Joüon's "un flux" (*Grammaire de l'Hébreu Biblique*, 113-*f*, 119-*u*) may possibly belong here.

[16] Thus Theis envisions the river-flood as carried off by canals.

[17] *Sumerisches Lexikon*, II, 4, 579, 427b.

[18] Note 6 above.

[19] *Sumerisches im alten Testament*, 1912, 11-19.

[20] *Hebr. u. Aram. Wörterbuch*, 4-5 *Aufl.* (1931), 4b.

And so to the question of grammatical construction. As to the passage of an infinitive construct into a finite verb in a subsequent clause, Cowley,[21] Driver,[22] and Joüon[23] give many examples from the Old Testament. But to find an exact parallel for Sachsse's and Bea's appeal to this construction in the present case, we must have the infinitive without pronominal suffixes, and governed by *lamed* as of purpose, result, or character ("a man did not exist to work," etc.). It is impossible to find every such passage in the Old Testament, but the combined examples of these three authors yield 27 in all. Here, however, arises a further question: how often, in such a case, does the direct object of the second clause precede its finite verb, as in אֵד יַעֲלֶה? Because of this inversion Leonard thinks the proposed translation "hardly more than a bare possibility."[24] This may seem too strict when one discovers that 17 of these 27 passages have a direct object (distinct from a mere suffix), and that in 12 of the 17 the object stands before the verb, as in אֵד יַעֲלֶה. But Leonard's objection gains force from the fact that only one of these 12 passages is in prose, and that here the verb must follow several objects or lose its emphasis.[25] It is evident that, where the direct object precedes its verb in this construction, we have a device of the Old Testament poets, not natural to historical prose. And, notwithstanding a propensity strangely prevalent in some quarters, it is equally clear that the opening chapters of Genesis are not poetical composition.[26]

Hence the newly proposed translation, while certainly grammatical, seems hardly idiomatic in such a context. Leonard is justified in objecting to the inverted order of verb and object in verse 6. Aptly enough may Isaias write of Cyrus, "whose right hand I have grasped, to subdue nations before him, and the loins

[21] 114-*r*.

[22] *Hebrew Tenses*, 117-118.

[23] 124-*q*.

[24] *Loc. cit.* p. 209.

[25] The passages are: 1 Kgs. 2:8b; Neh. 10:36-39 (the one in prose); Job 28:25; 33:17; Ps. 105:22; Prov. 2:8; 5:2; 8:21; Isa. 10:2b; 13:9b; 32:6c; 45:1b.

[26] Cf. König, *Einleitung*, pp. 26 ff., and the arrangement of the text of Genesis by Kittel or any critical editor.

of kings to unbind." But it is not so natural that Genesis should read, "There was not a man to work the soil, or a stream to bring up from the earth."

With the question of idiom before us, a further step suggests itself. The infinitive of purpose here expresses an attribute of "man," which is the subject of the negative verbal אֵין: "There did not exist a man to work the soil." Here complete statistics may be had. אֵין and its construct אֵין together occur in all constructions 774 times.[27] When its subject has an attribute of purpose, result, or characteristic, this is usually expressed by a participle.[28] Such cases are very abundant. On the other hand, the expression of such an attribute by the infinitive construct with *lamed* is found only 15 times outside our present passage.[29] Not one of these adds to the infinitive a further and correlative clause in any construction whatsoever. The adding of an attendant thought to that of an infinitive following the verbal אֵין is certainly alien to normal style both in prose and in poetry. Sachsse's and Bea's construction of Gen. 2:5-6 is sound enough in syntax, but if it is correct it stands alone in the Hebrew Scriptures.

When these ascertained facts are combined with the uncertainty that אֵד is a word of Sumerian origin meaning "canal-stream" —a point essential to the proposed rendering—one cannot but hesitate to adopt such a means of solving an apparent historical discrepancy in these two verses as modern scholars commonly translate them. How far, in fact, is this discrepancy clearly present "according to the rules of grammar?[30] The argument on which Bea insists is that the independent imperfect יַעֲלֶה in 6 must continue the situation described in 5 (supposing, of course, the current interpretation), and thus make the watering contemporary with the drought. It is true that a few radical critics of the German school have striven to establish contradiction in

[27] See Mandelkern's Concordance (1925), 44c-47c.

[28] Unless it be more correct to regard the participle itself as subject. Cf. such very common expressions as "there was no doer of good," "there is no hearer," "there will be no deliverer," etc.

[29] Namely, Gen. 19:31; Ex. 17:1; Num. 22:26; Ruth 4:4; 1 Kgs. 9:7; 14:6; 2 Par. 20:6; 22:9 (?); Esdr. 10:13; Job 34:22; Eccles. 4:10; Isa. 47:14; Jer. 19:11; Dan. 11:15; Mich. 7:1.

[30] Bea, *op. cit.* p. 148.

the narrative on this argument from grammar. But the value of their reasoning is disputed by equally competent Hebraists. The frequentative imperfect without a conjunction may be demanded by the nature of the phenomenon which the verb expresses, while yet that phenomenon (a recurrent "rising" and "watering") can be understood as subsequent to the previous drought. To mention no others, the account is thus interpreted by Franz Delitzsch[31] and Eduard König,[32] whose regard for the demands of Hebrew grammar will hardly be called in question. All things considered, the newly proposed translation does not appear to commend itself as superior to the current one.

W. H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.

[31] *Genesis* (Eng. transl. 1888), I, 117.
[32] *Die Genesis*, 1925, p. 198.

WITNESS OF THE EARLY CHURCH TO THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE GOSPELS

We shall not speak here of the divine Author of the Gospels, but only of their human authors. We shall endeavor to answer the question whether our four Gospels were written by the Apostles and disciples of the Apostles whose name they now bear in our Bible, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Historians agree that from the time of St. Irenaeus of Lyons (A. D. 135-202) there was a firmly established tradition to that effect. While such an agreement might seem to make it useless for us to cite the witnesses of what was the universal belief of the Christians around A. D. 200, we shall here set down their testimony because it not only manifests their own conviction but brings out the important point that the Churchmen of that time derived their information concerning the origin of the Gospels from an earlier age, or in other words that in A. D. 200 the tradition was already old.

Eusebius of Caesarea

We shall begin with one who, though he lived after A. D. 200, is a recognized witness of the mind of the Church of the earliest times, Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea. He was born c. 265, probably at Caesarea, where as a priest he worked with another learned priest, Pamphilus, to enrich the library of that city with new manuscripts. Pamphilus was carried away by the Diocletian persecution in 309, but Eusebius escaped. In 325 he signed the decrees of the Council of Nicaea; he had, however, Arian leanings and afterwards frequently sided with the enemies of St. Athanasius. However, his industry and his honesty as an historian are not questioned; and he was "one of the best read and most indefatigable workers the Church has ever known."[1] His most important work was the *Ecclesiastical History.*

The first eight books of this work, in which occur the passages we shall quote, seem to have been completed in 312. The history of the New Testament Canon was a matter of special study for Eusebius; he has transmitted many of the documents bearing on the subject, and made known very clearly what he himself thought, at least as regards the origin of the Gospels.

[1] Tixeront, *History of Patrology*, p. 186.

Beginning a list of the books of the New Testament, he says: "Now that we have reached this point it is reasonable to sum up the writings of the New Testament already mentioned. Well, then, we must set in the first place *the holy quaternion of the Gospels.*"[2]

The "holy quaternion of the Gospels" is ascribed by Eusebius unhesitatingly to Saints Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. He regarded them as canonical, acknowledged, and undisputed Scriptures. He does not purpose to say, as in the case of New Testament books about which differences of opinion existed or had existed, what authors of earlier ages used them; he merely promises to indicate "what they have said about them." He gives his own account of the origin of the Four Gospels in Book III, 24, before his statement about the "holy quaternion" which we have just cited.

The holy Apostles, he says, devoted themselves chiefly to oral preaching; they thought that it was mainly in view of this that they were endued with the *power* promised them by Our Lord (Acts 1:8), and had little desire to write books.

> Out of them all Matthew and John alone have left us memoirs of the Lord's discourses; and they, it is recorded, only came to write under compulsion. For Matthew first of all preached to the Hebrews; and when he was about to go also to others, he committed his Gospel to writing in his native tongue; thus he made his writings compensate those from whom he was departing for the lack of his bodily presence. And when Mark and Luke had already published their Gospels, it is said that John, who at all times had used unwritten preaching, at last came also to write, for the following reason. Those three which we have mentioned above having come already into the hands of all, including his own, it is said that he accepted them and attested their truth; but expressed the opinion that the narrative only lacked, it seems, an account of what had been done by Christ first of all and at the beginning of the preaching.[3]

About the Fourth Gospel, whose Apostolic origin is most contested nowadays, Eusebius says: "As to the treatises of John, the former of the epistles, as well as the Gospel, has been acknowledged as undisputed, both by the men of today and by the ancients also."[4]

[2] Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, xxv, 1 (translation of Lawlor and Oulton).
[3] *H. E.*, III, iii, 3 (Lawlor and Oulton).
[4] *H. E.*, III, xxiv, 17 (Lawler and Oulton).

ORIGEN

Origen, the pupil of Pantaenus and Clement of Alexandria, was born of Christian parents, most likely at Alexandria around A. D. 185. In 203 he succeeded Clement as head of the famous catechetical school of that city. He taught at Alexandria, though not continuously, till 230; and at Caesarea of Palestine at intervals from 230 till his death in 254 or 255.

He was prodigiously learned and acquainted with the tradition of many lands. Nowhere does he indicate that there was any question in his day regarding the authorship of the Gospels; he speaks only incidentally of this authorship when at the beginning of his Commentary on St. Matthew, he tells us of the order which tradition assigned to the Gospels:

> I have learned by tradition concerning the four Gospels, which alone are unquestionable in the Church of God under heaven, that the first to be written was that according to Matthew, who was once a tax-collector but afterwards an Apostle of Jesus Christ, who published it for those who from Judaism came to believe, composed as it was in the Hebrew language. The second, that according to Mark, who wrote it in accordance with Peter's instructions, whom also Peter acknowledged as his own in the Catholic epistle, speaking in these terms: *She that is in Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you; and so doth Mark my son* (1 Pet. 5:13). And thirdly, that according to Luke, who wrote, for those who from the Gentiles came to believe, *the Gospel* that was *praised* by Paul (2 Cor. 8:18). After them all, that according to John.[5]

Though Origen's subject led him to speak of the order of the Gospels, he never was called on to defend their authenticity. Even in his work against Celsus, a pagan who had written an elaborate attack on the Christian religion during the reign of Marcus Aurelius (c. 175 A. D.), he did not have to demonstrate the genuineness of the four Gospels. Celsus used them as his chief sources of information about Christianity; and though he formulated many of the objections urged by modern unbelievers, it did not occur to him to question the genuineness of the Christian writings.

CLEMENT

Clement of Alexandria, Origen's teacher, constantly uses the four Gospels and quotes them as belonging to Matthew, Mark,

[5] In *H. E.*, VI, xxv, 4-6 (Lawlor and Oulton).

Luke, and John. That he would know and follow tradition in such a matter may be inferred from his general attitude. Before settling down at Alexandria as the disciple of Pantaenus, whom he succeeded as head of the catechetical school in 190, he had studied in Greece, Italy, and the various parts of the East. The following passage from his *Stromata* refers to his links with the past and it manifests his preoccupation to keep as a basis of his speculation the solid teachings of tradition:

> This work is not written for ostentation. I treasure up in it souvenirs for my old age; it is a remedy against forgetfulness, an artless image, a reflection of those brilliant and lively discourses which I had the honor to hear, a remembrance of personages blessed and really worthy to be remembered. Of these, one, the Ionian, was in Greece, and another in Great Greece; one of them was from Coelosyria, another from Egypt. Others, however, there were, living in the Orient; of these one was an Assyrian,[6] another was a Hebrew by descent and lived in Palestine. But the last I met by chance, was really the first in worth;[7] having found him in Egypt, where he was hidden, I extended my search no farther. These men, preserving the true tradition of the blessed teaching which came directly from Peter and James, John and Paul, the holy Apostles, as a son receives the heritage of his father (however, few sons are like their fathers) had, by the grace of God, come down to our own days to plant in us those seeds which are from the ancestors and from the Apostles.[8]

Did Clement ever ask of the teachers whom he met in various parts of the world, who wrote the Gospels? It is not likely that he did. There is no evidence that this question, now so important, was a subject of inquiry at the time. It was, as we have said, a matter on which all agreed. Apparently the names of the four Evangelists were transmitted without hesitation from spiritual father to spiritual son. Clement, moreover, makes it abundantly clear that not only the Church's Gospels were attributed to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, but that no other Gospels were regarded as authoritative. In Stromata III. xiii, he says disparagingly of an alleged saying of the Lord quoted by Julius Cassianus, the Encratite, that it is not in the "four Gospels *handed down,* but in that according to the Egyptians."

[6] It is generally thought that Clement refers to Tatian.
[7] Pantaenus.
[8] In *H. E.*, V, xi, 13.

TERTULLIAN

Tertullian of Carthage, who was born probably about 160, wrote about A. D. 206 his largest extant work, five books *Against Marcion.* The refutation is out of Marcion's own books, namely the revised versions of Luke and of ten Epistles of St. Paul. Tertullian expresses clearly his own conviction about who wrote the Gospels: "Of the Apostles John and Matthew impart to us the faith; of the disciples Luke and Mark renew it." Moreover he indicates the source of his belief when he protests against this early attempt to select in the Bible what suits the chooser. In particular he protests against the rejection by Marcion of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and John, which had the testimony of the Apostolic churches:

> The same authority of the Apostolic Churches will uphold the other Gospels, which we have in due succession by them and according to them. I mean those of (the Apostles) Matthew and John; although that which was published by Mark may also be maintained to be Peter's whose interpreter Mark was; for the narrative of Luke also is generally ascribed to Paul; since it is allowable that what scholars publish should be regarded as their master's work. Well, then, Marcion ought to be called to a strict account concerning these (other Gospels) also, for having omitted them, and insisted in preference on Luke; as if they too had not free course in the churches as well as Luke's Gospel, from the beginning.[9]

THE MURATORIAN FRAGMENT

This document, discovered by L. A. Muratori in the Ambrosian Library of Milan in 1740, contains a catalogue of books of the New Testament. It is in Latin, but is generally regarded as a translation from the Greek. An idea is conveyed of its date in lines 73 and 76 which say that the Pastor of Hermas was written very recently (*nuperrime*) when Pius was bishop of Rome (140-155). Lines 38-39 indicate that the work was written at Rome since they speak of St. Paul's departing from the City (*ab urbe*). Lightfoot supposed this Canon to have been one of the earliest works of St. Hippolytus, whose literary activity, he held, began A. D. 185-190 (Apostolic Fathers, part I. ii. p. 413). This view regarding Hippolytus' authorship is shared by Zahn and Lagrange; they, however, would date the Canon *circa* 217 when

[9] *Adv. Marcion,* I, v, 6.

Hippolytus was an anti-pope. Lagrange conjectures that the source of Hippolytus' information was Papias.[10]

The Muratorian Fragment is mutilated at the beginning where we would expect a mention of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Its present shape commences with a notice of St. Luke which evidently refers back to St. Mark. We give the part concerning the Gospels in Lightfoot's translation:

.... At which he (Mark) was present and thus related.
The third book of the Gospel is that according to Luke. This Luke was a physician whom Paul took with him as a companion after the Ascension of Christ on account of his zeal for righteousness (*?juris*). He wrote in his own name and from hearsay; neither did he [*any more than Mark*] see the Lord in the flesh, and he, too, set down incidents as he was able to ascertain them.

The fourth Gospel is that of John, one of the disciples [men taught directly by Christ]. Being exhorted by his fellow disciples and bishops, he said, "Fast with me today for three days, and let us relate to one another what shall be revealed to each." The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should write down everything in his own name, and all should certify. And therefore, although various elements are taught in the several books of the Gospels, yet it makes no difference to the faith of the believer, since all things in all of them are declared by one Supreme Spirit, concerning the nativity, the passion, the resurrection, His intercourse with His disciples, and His two advents, the first in despised lowliness, which is already past, the second with the magnificence of kingly power, which is yet to come. What wonder then, if John so boldly puts forward each statement, in his epistle also saying of himself, "What we have seen with our eyes and heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things we have written unto you?" For so he avows himself to be not only an eyewitness and a hearer, but also a recorder, of all the wonderful things of the Lord in order.[11]

THEOPHILUS

Theophilus of Antioch a contemporary of Pope Soter (169-177) commented upon a Gospel harmony made by himself from

[10] See "Auteur du Canon de Muratori," *Revue Biblique*, XXXV (1926), p. 83 ff.

[11] The Latin text with all its barbarisms is edited by Zahn and reproduced by M. J. Rouet de Journel, S.J., in *Enchiridion Patristicum*. For a collation and a good description of the MS. see E. S. Buchanan, Journal of Theological Studies, VIII (1937), p. 540 ff.

the four Gospels.[12] This and the other works of Theophilus have been lost, with the exception of three books *Ad Autolycum.* In this work the name of only one Evangelist is mentioned: the opening verses of the fourth Gospel are cited as the words of John, "one of the inspired."[13]

ST. IRENAEUS

St. Irenaeus was born in the Roman province of Asia, where in his youth he had been a hearer of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, who died a martyr in 155 or 156. He succeeded St. Pothinus, himself an Asian, as bishop of Lyons in 177 or 178. He died probably in 202. We may date his birth c. 135. Two of his letters have survived and two learned treatises. They prove abundantly not only that he was, as Tertullian says, *"Omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus scrutator,"*[14] but a churchman in close touch with the Christians of Asia and with the Church of Rome. When he speaks of the events and opinions of the day his words are not to be weighed as those of a hermit, who meditated only on the things told him in his youth. This man, who had lived in Lyons as a priest of Pothinus and who succeeded him in the metropolis of the Gauls, was a prominent member of a great universal society which kept up constant intercommunication by travel, by the interchange of books and especially of letters. The "leading lights" and peculiar traditions of particular churches as well as the universally accepted usages and beliefs of his own and earlier times must have been fairly familiar to the bishop of Lyons. Dr. Drummond rightly says:

> Critics speak of Irenaeus as though he had fallen out of the moon, paid two or three visits to Polycarp's lecture room and never known anyone else. In fact he must have known all sorts of men, of all ages both in the East and West, and among others his most venerable predecessor Pothinus, who was upwards of ninety at the time of his death. He must have numerous links with the early part of the century.[15]

St. Irenaeus attached great importance to his intercourse with Polycarp. He says in his letter to Florinus, a Roman priest, who had with him listened to the venerable Bishop of Smyrna and

[12] St. Jerome in his epistle *Ad Algasiam.*
[13] *Ad Autolycum,* II, 22.
[14] *Contra Valentinum,* 5.
[15] Drummond, *Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel,* p. 348.

who was now fallen into Gnostic errors, that he could recall "the place where the venerable Polycarp used to sit when he discoursed, his goings out and his comings in, his manner of life and the appearance of his body, the discourses which he addressed to the congregation, how he told us of his intercourse with John and with others who had seen the Lord, and how he recalled their words." He adds:—

"What Polycarp heard from them about the Lord, and what he had received from them, as from eyewitnesses of the word of life, about His miracles and teaching, he announced, everything he said being in agreement with the Scriptures."[16]

Nothing indicates, however, that he regarded Polycarp as his only source for the traditions of the Apostles. He must have come in contact with many who had lived very near the Apostolic age and his books show that he had numerous writings of early Christian authors. There is nothing to stamp as unlikely the suggestion that comes to mind, as we hear him referring to some "divinely inspired" old man whose writings he is using, that he has in his hands a book of Melito of Sardis or some other treasure for which a modern student of early Christian tradition would give any price.

Moreover, he remarks that opponents of the Church themselves justify the Church's confidence in the Gospels:

But such is the certainty (firmitas) concerning the Gospels that the heretics themselves bear witness to them, and starting from them each one attempts to confirm his doctrine. The Ebionites, who use only the Gospel which is according to Matthew, are convicted from that Gospel itself of not holding the right doctrine about the Lord. Marcion, who mutilates that which is according to Luke, may be shown to be a blasphemer against the only God that exists by the things which are still preserved by him. They who separate Jesus from the Christ, and say that Christ remained impassible but that Jesus suffered, may, if they read with love of truth, be corrected by the Gospel according to Mark which they prefer. Those of the school of Valentinus, who make full use of that which is according to John, will be detected from this Gospel itself and shown to teach nothing aright, as we have done in the first book. Since, then, our opponents bear witness to us, and use these books, our demonstration from these is secure and true.[17]

[16] This letter is preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.*, V, 20.
[17] *Adv. Haereses*, iii, 10.

St. Irenaeus was very firmly convinced that all four Gospels should be used, and that there were no others:

> It is not possible that the Gospels be either more or fewer than they are.... All who destroy the form of the Gospel are vain, unlearned, and also audacious—those I mean who represent the aspects of the Gospel as being more in number than the aforesaid, or on the other hand fewer.[18]

It is quite plain that the four Gospels had been the Gospels, and the only Gospels, of the Church as far back as St. Irenaeus' memory went; that they were in 177 regarded as handed down from Apostolic times. He knows, indeed, that some heretics refuse to follow the Gospels, or all of them, but he gives as the reason of this rejection not critical doubts regarding their origin, but refusal to believe the Apostles. He is trying to convince them that they should accept the Apostolic preaching.

ALOGI

The only case in which we see even a heretic deny the traditional view about the origin of one of our Gospels is that of the Alogi, who rejected St. John's Gospel and attributed it to a first century heretic called Cerinthus, a contemporary of St. John.

St. Epiphanius doubtless has in view Gaius, a Roman heretic, when he speaks of the Alogi. These he appears to know only through Hippolytus, who had written a refutation of Gaius. Whether Gaius had any followers is not clear. His assertion that Cerinthus wrote the Fourth Gospel is manifestly baseless; and whether we regard him as the only *Alogos* or whether with Dom Chapman, we think of Gaius and Co., we should not take seriously this denial, the only one referred to in the history of the early Church. As Sanday puts it:

> Just as this period of which I am speaking [*circa* 200] these dissentients appear and disappear, leaving so little trace that Eusebius, who is really a careful and candid person, and has ancients like Origen and Clement behind him, can describe the Gospel as unquestioned both by his own generation and by the preceding generation.[19]

We have recorded the testimony of Eusebius, Origen and of all the writers of the end of the second century who mention the names of the Evangelists. Their witness is such as to put beyond

[18] *Adv. Haereses*, iii, 11.
[19] *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 238 ff.

question what was the universal belief of the period *circa* 200 and of still earlier times concerning the authorship of the Gospels. Now this universal belief of the Catholic Church is certainly an impressive fact. It would be hard to understand how a man like Origen could be mistaken about such a point; it would be still harder to conceive the possibility of error on the part not of one such man only, but on the part of him, Tertullian, Clement, and St. Irenaeus as well; it is a moral impossibility that the whole Christian society had come to attach wrong names to documents which had long been read publicly and privately as regulating their faith and their conduct, and that without question or doubt.

Unfortunately for us, perhaps, the opponents of the Church did not attack her belief concerning the writers of the Gospels and thus evoke a defense of their genuineness and historical reliability. Eusebius, Origen, Clement, or Tertullian could have justified their belief by many testimonies of earlier writings now lost to us; but the calm assumption of the great Church writers of the time regarding the origin of the Gospels is, in itself, very strong evidence for the truth of the tradition.

WENDELL S. REILLY, S.S.

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

This, as is well known, is the title given to Our Lord's prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world.* It is contained in the three synoptic Gospels: Matthew, Mark, and Luke; there is nothing parallel to it in our fourth Gospel.

My intention is not to write an extensive commentary nor a refutation of the tenets of the eschatological school, but to put before the readers of the Quarterly a new division of the Discourse, which, it is hoped, will shed some light on difficulties that have vexed the exegetes of all centuries.

However, before attacking the main issue, we shall do well to consider briefly the genuineness and historicity of the Gospel account of the Discourse, and to look more closely at the question of the Apostles which gave rise to it. This will be the subject-matter of the present article.

Genuinity

One thing may be assumed from the outset: The eschatological Discourse, as we read it in our synoptic Gospels, is neither an interpolation nor has it been substantially mutilated. It is an original part of the three Gospels, and has not undergone any substantial change in transmission. For this we have the evidence of the earliest manuscripts (including the Chester Beatty papyrus), of all the early versions (including Tatian's Diatessaron), of uncounted citations in the Fathers—evidence which has resulted in the uniform text which appears in all modern critical editions of the three Gospels.

So much from the standpoint of textual criticism. Dogmatically, it is certain that all three accounts are "sacred and canonical"; for they are evidently "part" of Scripture, in the sense of the definition of the Council of Trent.[1]

Historicity

If one asks whether the eschatological Discourse is historical, he may mean two things: a) Did Our Lord really pronounce the

* This paper was read in part at the annual meeting of the American Catholic Biblical Association at Hartford, Conn., Oct. 1, 1938.

[1] Denzinger, n. 784.

Discourse, or is it (wholly or in part) a fiction of the evangelists or perhaps of the early Church? b) Is the setting of the Discourse as given by the synoptics historically true, or perhaps merely a rhetorical device?

I shall answer the two questions separately. Let me remark, however, that, from the dogmatic standpoint, there can be no doubt that the answer to the first question and partly also to the second must be in the affirmative. The evangelists evidently intended to narrate a historical fact and to indicate, to some extent, the circumstances of time and place in which that fact happened. Therefore, according to the Catholic doctrine of inspiration, the narratives must be historically true.

HISTORICITY OF THE DISCOURSE

A number of modern non-Catholic scholars accept the substance of the Discourse as historical. Lepin[2] cites the following: B. Weiss, Wendt, O. Holtzmann, Stapfer, Wernle, Wellhausen, Schmiedel, Renan. But three other opinions are current today outside of the Catholic Church. a) R. H. Lightfoot, a champion of the Formgeschichte, writes: "In the discourse we may see, reflected as it were in a mirror, the travail, the perplexity and the unconquerable hope of early Christianity."[3] And "we may regard it as an effort on the part of the church to apply the teaching of Jesus to its present urgent needs."[4] b) Others think that the evangelists themselves misrepresented the Master's thought, giving us instead their own idea. c) Colani and Weizsäcker, in 1864, arrived at the conclusion that an apocalypse written by a Jew or a Jewish Christian was, by the synoptics, amalgamated with some genuine sayings of Our Lord.[5] J. Weiss, writing in 1906, thought himself sufficiently competent to indicate to the eye the sections borrowed from the apocalypse.[6] But Montefiore, writing some years later, says: "The portions which are of Jewish origin, or of Christian origin, or, lastly, which proceeded from the mouth of Jesus, can never be distinguished with certainty."[7]

[2] Lepin, *Christ and the Gospel*, pp. 429-430.

[3] Lightfoot, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, p. 94.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 124.

[5] Lepin, *op. cit.*, p. 449; Weizsäcker, *The Apostolic Age*, I, 18-26; Von Dobschütz, *The Eschatology of the Gospels*, pp. 85-86.

[6] J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des N. T.*, p. 178.

[7] Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, I, p. 296.

All three opinions clash, of course, with the Catholic doctrine of the inspiration of the Gospels. But they can be shown, even on purely historical grounds, to be without foundation. We shall consider first the internal, then the external evidence.

1. Internal Evidence

A careful reading of the Discourse bears out the contention that it is not fiction, either wholly or in part. Let me suggest three lines of reasoning:

a. All exegetes, from the days of Origen to our own, have labored in the sweat of their brows to render the *sequence of thought* intelligible. The eschatological Discourse may fairly be called the despair of the commentators. Yet this very obscurity, evidently unintentional on the part of the writers, is a guarantee of its historicity. For, I ask, would it be so baffling if the synoptics or the early Christians had invented it? We find little difficulty in understanding the fictitious discourses which the writers of the apocryphal Gospels put in the mouth of Our Lord.

This is also our answer to the Formgeschichte. Could a discourse, so perplexing and obscure, be the means to remove the perplexities of the early Christians, to raise their hopes, to ease their travail?

b. "The actual *structure of the discourse*, in the different evangelists, is most worthy of attention, by reason of the great number of common features that all contain—rhythmic sayings, characteristic sequences, guiding marks still visible even when they have been moved out of position. This fundamental identity in the passages common to them makes it impossible for us to doubt that, underlying our triple synopsis, we have here a primitive collection of the sayings of Jesus on this subject."[8]

c. In the second Gospel (Mk. 13:32), most probably also in the first (Mt. 24:36), Our Lord openly avows *ignorance* of the day of judgment. Nor is this a gloss which might have slipped into a narrative otherwise historical; rather, as we shall see, it is fundamental to a whole section of the Discourse.

Again, I ask, who in the first generation of Christians, among whom the synoptic Gospels originated, would have dared to think or say aloud that Our Lord was ignorant of anything? Even rationalists admit today that the early Church looked upon Him

[8] Grandmaison, *Jesus Christ*, III, p. 258.

as God and therefore as omniscient. Students of 19th century rationalism will remember that Mk. 13:32 is one of Schmiedel's "pillar-truths," one of those sayings of Our Lord which certainly were not invented, but written down because actually uttered by Him.*

Let us add two reasons against the supposition that a Jewish or Jewish Christian apocalypse has here been amalgamated with genuine sayings of Our Lord. First of all, there is no trace of such an apocalypse. Secondly, while Christ often spoke the language of His time and may even have used the apocalyptic imagery of His countrymen to describe the end of the world, yet the underlying ideas were totally different. Only a superficial reader can say with J. Weiss[9] that Our Lord merely repeats the teachings and views of the old prophets.

2. External Evidence

For the assertion that the Discourse is historical, we have *three contemporary witnesses,* more or less independent of one another. Of two of them we can easily determine whence they derived their information; the third must be given credence on general principles.

a. *Matthew,* an Apostle, could easily learn the facts from the four who heard the Discourse from the lips of Our Lord. Some think that all Apostles were present at its delivery, though only four are mentioned as proposing the question. Be that as it may, the subject must have been a sensation to the Apostles, and we may be sure that those who had not heard the Discourse actually spoken, were most anxious to know its contents.—We also know that many in the infant Church expected an early return of the Lord, an expectation which was at least partially based on this Discourse. We may be sure then that the Apostles were appealed to again and again as to what the Master had exactly said on that memorable occasion. Can we imagine that Matthew brushed such appeals aside with a flourish of his hand? Lastly, we know that the Apostles were, from the day of Pentecost, fully conscious of their office of being witnesses, of testifying to what the Master

* EDITOR'S NOTE: It is the common teaching of the Church that Christ did know when the last judgment was to take place, but not with a knowledge that He was to communicate to others.

[9] J. Weiss, *op. cit.,* pp. 53, 178.

had taught. Now, Our Lord, in several places of the Discourse, appeals to His own authority and tells His hearers explicitly that His words are meant for all.

We may then set down Matthew either as an eye-witness or as one who had his information from eye-witnesses. The sensational nature of the Discourse, human curiosity, the consciousness of his apostolic office—all would urge him to make sure of the details of the Discourse.

b. There is no mystery whence *Mark*, the second evangelist, derived his knowledge. Mark was not only a member of the early Church at Jerusalem, but socially rather prominent in it. Even if he had not been particularly anxious about the sayings and doings of the Master, he could not help hearing what the Apostles taught in their catechetical instructions and what the early Christians discussed with so much fervor. And the return of the Lord, the great day of the Parousia, was certainly one of their favorite subjects. But apart from this general consideration, Mark could easily have known what he wrote. He was in later years, as Papias tells us, the follower of Peter, and wrote his Gospel in accordance with what he and many others had heard Peter preach. In fact, Papias assures us that Mark would not insert anything in his Gospel except what he had heard from Peter's lips.

Mark, therefore, though not an eye-witness to the Discourse, cannot be pushed aside as untrustworthy. Need we even be surprised that his account is at times more detailed than that of Matthew?

c. What is the historical value of *Luke's* account? Luke certainly had not been an eye-witness. Nor is it clear whence he derived his information, at least as far as his narrative differs from the other two. But there is no valid reason for thinking that, when writing this chapter, he forgot his general working principles set forth in the prologue to the Gospel. Moreover, Luke's accuracy in historical matters is today assailed by few; recent researches and discoveries have substantiated his writings so often that even hostile critics have become wary of challenging his statements.

Luke's historical authority then stands unshaken. Moreover, his testimony is to some extent independent, since it evidently rests on sources partially different from those of Matthew and Mark.

The argument from what we have called "external evidence," supposes, of course, that the synoptic Gospels are genuine, that is, written by those whose names they bear and to whom they have been attributed without hesitation since the second century. Their genuinity is also the best answer to the difficulties raised by the Formgeschichte. For if the Gospels are written by an Apostle and two intimate disciples of Apostles, it matters little that the deeds and sayings of Our Lord had been current in the Christian community either separately or combined appropriately to the contents, orally or in writing. We know their historical truth from the trustworthiness of the authors of the Gospels.

HISTORICITY OF THE SETTING

The question to be discussed here is this: Was the eschatological Discourse given on the occasion indicated by the synoptics, or is it merely a sample of editorship? In other words: Did Our Lord pronounce a rather long discourse on that definite occasion, or did the evangelists combine into one sayings which Our Lord perhaps uttered on various occasions?

a. Doubts on the subject have been suggested by four considerations:

There is first of all the *parable of the talents,* which forms part of the Discourse in Matthew (25:14-30). Now, this parable is thought by many to be the same as that given by Luke (19:12-27), where, however, it has an entirely different setting.

One part of the Discourse, common to Mark and Luke (Mk. 13:9-13 and Lk. 21:12-19), is inserted elsewhere by Matthew. He joins it with Our Lord's instructions to the Apostles (Mt. 10:17-22) on the occasion of their first missionary journey.

Another part of the Discourse, common to Matthew and Mark, is given another place by Luke (17:22-37), viz., in answer to the question of the Pharisee: "When shall the kingdom of God come?"

Lastly, the graphic description of the Last Judgment, which forms part of the Discourse in Matthew (25:31-46), is absent in Mark and Luke.

b. But in spite of these and other discrepancies, there can be no reasonable doubt on two points:

The general outline of the Discourse is certainly historical. As we shall see, its constituent parts are so closely parallel in the three Gospels that only the fact of their delivery as an actual

discourse can account for it. Even within the single parts, the parallelism is, as a rule, so pronounced and the divergencies so characteristic that little doubt remains about the sequence of thought.

Also the external setting of the Discourse must correspond to facts. All three evangelists describe the particular occasion in detail, and their details agree. In all three Gospels, too, the Discourse immediately precedes the account of the Passion, except that Luke (21:37-38) inserts one sentence which summarizes Our Lord's teaching activity during the last days before the Passion.

There is indeed a slight discrepancy between Luke and the other two synoptics. Luke seems to place the whole Discourse within the Temple, whereas the other two evangelists clearly say that it was pronounced on Mount Olivet. But the discrepancy arises only from lack of detail in Luke's account; there is nothing positive in his setting to contradict the more accurate narrative of Matthew and Mark.[10]

c. Finally, as regards the discrepancies singled out above, three common solutions offer themselves:

Some of the sayings of Our Lord, which are assigned to different occasions by different evangelists, were really uttered more than once; and though substantially the same, they may have been varied by Him on account of particular circumstances.

Though the Discourse as combined from the three accounts was uttered only on that occasion, some of the sayings were, by one or the other evangelist, embodied in a different context, which, however, resembles the original one. This particular solution would seem to be applicable to the parable of the talents.

Though uttered on other occasions, some of the sayings were, by the evangelists, incorporated in the eschatological Discourse, because they fitted in with its particular purpose.

Anyone of these three hypotheses is acceptable, historically and dogmatically. We shall probably never know the full truth.

THE QUESTION OF THE APOSTLES

To understand the particular occasion which gave rise to the eschatological Discourse, many commentators refer us back to Christ's prophecy in Matthew (23:28), "Your house will be left desolate." Rightly, it seems. That prophecy, though pronounced

[10] Cf. Knabenbauer, *Comm. in Lucam*, pp. 559, 571-572.

against the Pharisees, was stunning to the Apostles, as it must have been to any pious Jew. They naturally took it to mean that the city of Jerusalem was to be destroyed.

On the way out of the city and up Mount Olivet, they pondered this dire prediction in silence. Their minds could not fathom it. Glancing back again and again at the doomed city, the Temple outlined itself against the evening sky in all its majesty and indescribable beauty. If the city was to be destroyed, what about the Temple? Or should not rather the city be spared for the sake of the Temple?

Such or similar thoughts seem to have provoked the appeal of one Apostle: "Master, look, what gigantic stones, what magnificent structures" (Mk. 13:1). "And Jesus said to him: Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left here a stone upon a stone, that shall not be thrown down" (Mk. 13:2). Our Lord's answer is hardly more than an emphatic repetition of what He had threatened the Pharisees in the Temple.

A short interval elapsed between this answer and the next question: "And when He was seated upon the Mount of Olives, over against the temple, Peter and James and John and Andrew asked Him privately: Tell us when these things shall be, and what shall be the sign that they are all about to be accomplished" (Mk. 13:3-4).

According to this account (as well as that of Luke), the Apostles are concerned only with the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. This is what, in the context, they meant by *ταῦτα... πάντα*. But Matthew tells us that the question was threefold: a) When will the city and the Temple be destroyed? b) What sign will tell us that Thy coming and c) the end of the world is nigh?

What is the relation between the two versions of the question? Was the question formulated as given by Mark and Luke, or did it explicitly mention the three events, as Matthew seems to say? No satisfactory answer has yet been given. But whether the other two events were mentioned explicitly or not, they certainly lurked in the questioners' minds. For the pious Jew, the last two events, the Parousia and the end of the world, were identical. The future destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple was indeed something new; but putting two and two together, the Apostles were sure that it, too, belonged to the end of time.

A. C. COTTER, S. J.

THE URIM AND THUMMIM

These mysterious words, transliterated from the Hebrew, designate some small objects which were placed in the breastplate or *rational* of the High Priest and by means of which he consulted God and received God's answer in matters of great importance. I prefer to call them by their Hebrew titles rather than to translate them into the English equivalents which would most probably be "Light and Perfection."

This article will not propose any strict attempt at a solution of the question as to what the Urim and Thummim were and how they were used, but will attempt to 1) assemble the data that can be obtained from Holy Scripture; 2) refute the theories that seem to be rather fantastic; and 3) propose the theory that seems most common and most probable.[1]

The mysterious words are given to us for the first time in the book of Exodus as if they needed no explanation. The apparel of the High Priest is being described.

Over the ephod there is to be placed a "breastplate of judgment," the color of which was gold, scarlet, purple, and fine linen folded square and doubled (like our burse). On it are set four rows of precious stones. On each stone is engraved a name of one of the tribes of Israel, that Aaron may bear them upon his heart.

Then comes a further order from God. Inside the breastplate, just as the tablets were to be placed inside the Ark (preposition אֶל used in both places), Urim and Thummim were to be placed and they too were to be worn on the heart of Aaron. "Pones autem in rationale judicii Doctrinam et Veritatem [Hebrew has *Urim* and *Thummim*], et erunt in pectore Aaron quando ingredietur coram Domino" (Ex. 28:30).

Not a word of explanation is given. They are mentioned as known to Moses and to the people, or at least to Moses, and connected naturally with the functions of the High Priest as mediating between Yahweh and the people.

This command is fulfilled, as we see from the book of Leviticus. "Et posuit Moyses super eum (Aaron) pectorale et dedit

[1] This method seems better than the one followed in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.

in pectorali Doctrinam et Veritatem" (Urim and Thummim. Lev. 8:8).

The Urim and Thummim then pass from Aaron to Eleazar along with the ephod and all the rest of the pontifical vestments, and when Josue is appointed to succeed Moses as leader of the chosen people, he is bidden to stand before Eleazar the priest "who shall ask counsel for him after the judgment of *Urim* (English is "revelation"; Vulgate has "Eleazar shall consult the Lord." Num. 27:21). This counsel is to determine the movements of the host of Israel.

In the blessing of Moses upon the people just before his death the Urim and Thummim appear as the crowning glory of the tribe of Levi. Moses says to Levi: "Perfectio tua, et doctrina tua viro sancto tuo" (Deut. 33:8). Notice here that the words in the Hebrew are Thummim and Urim in inverted order. These words of blessing were said by Moses to Levi as a reward for the zeal which led the Levites to close their eyes to everything but the Law and the Covenant.

So much for the time of Moses and the times immediately following. Once and only once are the Urim and Thummim mentioned by name in the history of the monarchy. Saul, left to his self-chosen darkness, is answered "neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets" (1 Kgs. 28:6).

In the times of Esdras and Nehemias there is no longer a "priest with Urim and Thummim" to answer difficult questions. When will one appear? (1 Esd. 2:63; 2 Esd. 7:65).

Besides the direct statements about the Urim and Thummim referred to above, there are other indications in which we may, without doing violence to the texts, trace a reference if not to both at least to the Urim. Questions precisely of the same nature as those asked in Num. 27:21 are asked by the leader of the people and answered by Yahweh.

In Jdgs. 1:1 Yahweh is consulted as to who shall go up first or assume the leadership against the Chanaanites, and He answers that Juda shall go up. Again when the same question is asked God during the civil war against Benjamin (Jdgs. 20:18), He again answers that Juda shall take the lead.

Similar important questions are asked of the High Priest "wearing an ephod" by Saul (1 Kgs. 14:3-18) and by David as soon after his flight as he has with him a High Priest with an ephod (1 Kgs. 23:2; 30:7-8).

The answers in these cases are always brief, but certainly they seem to be more than a mere "yes" or "no," in fact some of the questions could not be answered by "yes" or "no." And in all these cases surely we do no violence to the texts if we see in them a reference to the Urim and Thummim.

A favorite view of Jewish and of some Christian writers has been that Urim and Thummim were identical with the twelve stones on which the names of the tribes of Israel were engraved. According to these authorities the oracle was given by illumiation either simultaneous or successive, of the letters which were to make up the answer.[2]

Josephus identified Urim and Thummim with the sardonyxes on the shoulders of the ephod. He said these stones would be bright before a victory or when a sacrifice was acceptable, and dark when any disaster was impending.[3]

But to refute these opinions it is sufficient to point out the fact that in Holy Scripture the Urim and Thummim are distinguished clearly from all the other precious stones, and Moses is commanded to place them inside the rational, that is between the two folds of the burse, and not on the outside.

A theory which involves fewer contradictions and fewer gratuitous assertions is the one held by Buxtorf, Lightfoot, and others. They said a stone or plate of gold was placed in the middle of the ephod. On this stone or gold plate the name of Yahweh was engraved and by virtue of this, that is by fixing his gaze intently on the name or invocation engraved with the name, the High Priest became capable of prophesying or of hearing and understanding the Divine Oracle that proceeded from the Mercy Seat above the Ark of the Covenant.

But again we insist on the texts which say that the Urim and Thummim were put *inside* the rational not *on it.* Also the texts of Scripture clearly point to two objects, Urim and Thummim, not to only one.

Many look to Egypt for light and compare the Urim and Thummim with objects in use among the ancient Egyptians.

The Bible texts surely give an apparent basis for this comparison. It is pretty clear in the Bible texts quoted in the beginning of this article, that Urim is not identical with Thummim

[2] Among others, Maimonides, Driesius, and St. John Chrysostom held this.
[3] Cf. Works of Josephus, one volume, English; Antiquities, III, 8, 7.

and that neither is identical with the stones on the rational or breastplate of the High Priest. And the texts intimate that the meaning and mode of working of the Urim and Thummim were known well at least to Moses, since there is no description by God recorded in the sacred text.

Beginning then with Thummim, many find a striking analogy in Egypt. The priest-judges of Egypt, many of whom Moses certainly knew, wore suspended on a golden chain hanging around their necks, a figure which Greek writers describe as an image of Truth (Tme or Thme).[4] Often these images were made of sapphire or other precious stones and therefore necessarily small. The priests were to see in this image a symbol of the purity of motive without which they would be unworthy of their office. They touched the lips of the litigant with this image as they bade him speak the truth.

This parallelism between Thummim and the image of Truth worn by the Egyptian priest-judges certainly commended itself to the Septuagint translators. They uniformly translated Thummim by *ἀλήθεια*, "Truth."

A remarkable passage from Philo[5] states that the breastplate of the High Priest was made strong that he might wear as an image the two virtues which were so needful to his office, justice and truth. In Egypt many images of judges have been found. Around the neck of each judge are seen two figures (male and female?) of Thme. Thummim and Thme sound alike. The coincidence may be accidental but it is striking.

Having drawn this similarity between Thummim and Thme, the authorities that look to Egyptian customs to explain Urim and Thummim, ask whether there is any symbol of light standing in the same relation to Urim (plural of Hebrew word for light) as Thme, the symbol of truth, stands to Thummim.

On the breast of almost every member of the priestly caste in Egypt there hung a pectoral plate, corresponding to the pectoral (rational) of the Jewish High Priest.[6] In most of these pectorals, in the center is found what was known to be the symbol of light. The material of the symbol varied according to the rank of the bearer. The form of the symbol was uniformly the

[4] Breasted, *A History of Egypt*, p. 173.
[5] From the *Life of Moses*, III, 11, quoted by Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, p. 1603.
[6] Cf. Breasted, *op. cit.*

mystic Scarab or Beetle. Out of the mud which the Nile left during its perennial floods men saw myriad forms of life issue. That of the beetle was most conspicuous. To the Egyptians it seemed self-generated, called into being by the Light, the child therefore of the Sun. The beetle thus became the symbol of Ra and of its creative power.

In older Egypt the beetle seems to have been at any rate connected with the thought of divine illumination. It is found frequently united with the symbolic eye, the emblem of providence. Hence the beetle became a symbolic word, a sculptured word for light or illumination.

The opinion then resolves itself into the following. Urim was a sculptured beetle meaning light; Thummim a sculptured image of Tme, meaning truth.[7]

These two symbols were set deep among the gems that represented all Israel, themselves representing that light and truth were the center of the nation's life. Belonging as they did to the breastplate of the supreme judge of Israel they would bear witness that the High Priest in oracular acts needed above all things spotless integrity and illumination.

In refutation of this theory nothing new need be added to what we have said before. The theory does not in any way clear up the texts of Holy Scripture.

According to Holy Scripture, the Urim and Thummim were not mere symbols. They were some objects which God had designated as instruments of His infallible answers to questions of importance. Further, they were not *on the breastplate* so that they could be seen but were *inside* the rational, and nobody could see them except the High Priest, and he probably only at certain times. They were a part of his most official regalia. Hence they could not be a perpetual reminder. Evidently they were used only very rarely.[8]

Amid all this confusion, which is caused mostly by the fact that so many have wandered as far as possible from the Scripture

[7] Cf. Smith, *Dictionary of the Bible, loc. cit.*

[8] Kortleitner, *Archæologia Biblica*, p. 203, says in regard to the parallelism between Urim and Thummim and Egyptian customs: "Cum igitur magna sit differentia inter insigne illud Aegyptiorum et oraculum sacrum Hebraeorum, similitudo vero vel nulla vel exigua, cumque nullo historiae testimonio constet insigne illud Aegyptium ante aetatem Moysis in usu fuisse, perperam affirmatur oraculum sacrum Hebraeorum ad exemplum Aegyptiorum a Moyse institutum esse."

texts to build up theories more or less fantastic, it will be best to follow the intimations of the sacred texts as closely as possible.

First it is clear that the Urim and Thummim constituted some kind of oracle, that is, by means of the Urim and Thummim oracular answers were given by Yahweh when He was consulted through them by the High Priest. It is equally clear that this oracle was distinct from the pectoral or rational which contained the Urim and Thummim inside of it. We may therefore define Urim and Thummim in the general terms of Kortleitner who says that Urim and Thummim constituted a sacred oracle placed in the pectoral plate, by means of which Yahweh, when consulted by the High Priest in matters of moment, manifested His will.[9]

It seems clear also that the oracle existed already in the time of Moses and that he at least knew it well. He is not told to make it or have it made but simply to place it within the breastplate or rational of the High Priest.

There seems to have been more than one object, that is, Urim was distinct from Thummim, but most probably there were not more than two objects.

So far nothing definite has been discovered as to the material of the Urim and Thummim, their shape or form, nor as to the manner in which they were used. And the manner in which Yahweh answered, whether by vision, by word or in some other way, all these are questions that for the present must be left unanswered.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie* (3rd. ed., Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer, 1927), pp. 344-51.

James Henry Breasted, *A History of Egypt* (2nd ed., New York: Scribner's, 1912), pp. 80-82, 173.

J. Hastings, *A Dictionary of the Bible* (6th impression, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904), Vol. IV, 838-840.

Flavius Josephus (English Translation, New York: Leavitt & Allen, 1853), *Antiquities* III, 8, 7-8.

Franciscus X. Kortleitner, O. Praem., *Archæologia Biblica* (Editio nova, Oeniponte: Libraria Academica Wagneriana, 1917), pp. 198-204.

Wm. Smith, LL. D., *A Dictionary of the Bible* (London: John Murray, 1863), Vol. III pp. 1600-1606.

EDWARD A. MANGAN, C.Ss.R.

[9] Cf. Kortleitner, *Archæologia Biblica*, p. 198.

THE PROFESSORS OF SCRIPTURE AND THE DISCUSSION STUDY CLUB

One of the most effective means of promoting Catholic Action today is the Discussion Study Club. Its purpose is to develop among the Catholic laity a knowledge of the truths of our faith and a convincing expression of religious thought. By means of group study among men and women both young and old the beauty and strength of our religion are revealed, and the discussion which accompanies the study develops a habit of talking fluently and intelligently about our faith.

It must be regretfully admitted that with the exception perhaps of a few bits of local parish or diocesan gossip religion is rarely discussed by many of our Catholics, including even those who are practical in the observance of their religion. And what is still more to be regretted, many of our good Catholics are mute in their reply when asked by one of their non-Catholic friends or by one less fervent in the practice of his faith about some doctrine or view of the Catholic Church.

As Bishop O'Hara, the chairman of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, said at this convention held three years ago in Rochester:

> Every thoughtful Catholic must be deeply concerned with the problem of adult religious education because it is so inextricably interwoven with every effort to advance the cause of religion. Our lay societies will not flourish without enlightened leadership.... Our leading periodicals languish for lack of a Catholic reading public.... In practically every parish and mission there is need of lay catechists to educate our youth.... Our laity must represent the Church to non-Catholics, few of whom ever meet the priest. But to say that the laity are inarticulate in the face of non-Catholic interrogations is to confess that they have no mastery of Catholic doctrine.... These and a score of similar considerations point to the need of a program of adult religious education.

Many fine results have been attained during the last few years in the Discussion Study Clubs that have been sprouting throughout the country. They have become one of the most efficient instruments of the Catholic Church in spreading abroad a knowledge of her nature, purpose, and doctrine. In the present times there may be a tendency on the part of these Clubs to de-

vote themselves more to a consideration of social and economic questions as they affect the Church, rather than to a consideration of her dogmas. True it is that they should concern themselves deeply with such evils as that of Communism, pointing out that its philosophy of life is based upon the materialistic interpretation of history, and upon the denial of the existence of God and the after-life, asserting that man is merely a social animal with no spiritual nature and no eternal destiny; that economically it denies the right of the individual to own any productive property, claiming that the instruments of production should all be in the hands of the State; that politically it advocates the absolute supremacy of the State over the political, social, economic, cultural, and religious life of the individual, urging men to revolution and open class warfare as the only effective means for the establishment of the Communistic State with its absolute monopoly of the land and wealth of a nation. A more constructive training for a Catholic outlook on life, however, should not be forgotten. Nay, more, it should hold the primary place in the study and discussion of a Club, and the foremost place in this training should be given to the Bible.

The Bible is one of the most familiar, and yet one of the least known books in the world. Few homes, especially Catholic ones, are without it. Within its pages are inscribed the dates of marriages, births, and deaths. In a court of justice the witness laying his hand upon it testifies to the truth of what he is about to say. Yet these external formalities often conceal a general unfamiliarity with God's own book. To thousands of our Catholics the Bible is but a name. They know that it plays an important part in the religious activities of the church to which a non-Catholic friend may belong; they have neighbors who frequent a Bible-class in the nearby church; they may hear Judge Rutherford with his witnesses of Jehovah appealing to its pages to refute the claims of the Catholic Church. But of its contents they may be sadly and entirely ignorant. Over a lunch-counter on some Monday or other they may wonder at the enthusiasm of a Baptist or Lutheran friend as he repeats the biblical lore of his newly-appointed minister preached on the previous Sabbath.

This lack of knowledge of the Bible is due almost in its entirety to us priests. Our liturgy has such a wealth of beautiful and substantial ceremonies, so radically unlike those of the other

faiths, that we may feel justified in looking on a presentation of the Bible as something superfluous, but we do not realize that we are keeping the Bible from our people and leaving them ignorant of God's own book, unmindful of the rebuke given by St. Jerome in a letter to Paulinus of Nola: "Ignoratio Scripturarum, ignoratio Christi est."

A most worthy weapon has been placed in the hands of those of us who by profession are called to teach the Sacred Scriptures, something by which we may make the Bible better known and loved by our lay Catholics, and it is the Study Club. It should inspire us to direct our classes towards this practical end, as well as engaging in some extra-seminary activities to promote such a noble cause.

Bishop Hedley in the chapter on the Study of Holy Scripture in his *Lex Levitarum* offers the suggestion that perhaps in our courses too much information is given about the Bible, with not enough time devoted to the study of the Bible itself. Whether this criticism strikes home or not, we might devote some of our classes to a real practical course on the Bible, having in mind that our seminarians are the ones to whom the direction of these Clubs will be confided later on. Some classes could be conducted after the manner of a seminar; we might even adopt, occasionally at least, the system employed by those who train candidates for the talks of the Catholic Evidence Guild, by assigning special biblical topics to certain students, such as an elementary exposition of the doctrine of Inspiration, or the meaning and purpose of the parable, and then choosing other students as hecklers. A number of interesting biblical pamphlets are already at hand that could be used for this purpose besides the ordinary text books. In this way hope may be had that the seminarian realizing the practicality of the Bible, and acquiring a simple method of pedagogy in imparting its divine message, will not only concern himself with Study Clubs after his ordination, but will himself give a biblical coloring to his Sunday sermons, and will be enabled to devote himself more prayerfully to the daily recitation of his Breviary.

Experience has proved that the Study Club should be composed of small groups, rarely of more than ten or twelve members, for otherwise general discussion would be impossible. The same experience has shown that the leader of the group should

be a member of the laity, for in a parish where there might be a number of clubs it would be physically impossible for a priest to attend every session of the clubs. Moreover, the constant presence of a priest would have a tendency to repress free expression by a large number of the members. The qualities necessary for good leadership are primarily common sense and generosity of service, but then scholarship too is an absolute requisite. As the kindly Saviour instructed his apostles in the truths of the Christian religion before they set out on their missionary tours of Galilee and Judea, so too it would be a real priestly charity for the professor of Sacred Scripture to take a group of these various leaders as protegés, and instruct them in the hidden treasures and consoling messages of the Bible. And they will be found a most responsive audience. Who of us has not experienced the rapt attention of a congregation when in a Sunday sermon we explained the words of the centurion protesting to Christ: "For I also am a man subject to authority, having under me soldiers; and I say to this, Go, and he goeth, and to another, Come, and he cometh, and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it" (Mt. 8:9). Or as we unravelled the dates of Tiberius Caesar and Pontius Pilate, and located the country of Abilina with the meaning of tetrarch, while devoting our sermon to penance and John the Baptist. Our Catholics would like to hear more of this information, and a systematic offering of it would make them realize that the myth of the Bible's being chained from their reach is literally untrue.

Our biblical association is about to realize a great achievement with the revision of the New Testament in English and its commentary. However, the Bible still remains to be put into the hands of our Catholic people. A more personal contact will be indispensable in order to make them realize its beauty and worth, and the Discussion Study Club offers this contact.

Outlines of study have been furnished by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in addition to many brochures and pamphlets that have been published by various houses, and which are suitable for study and discussion in the Club. Notwithstanding, as regards the exposition of matters biblical, much is to be desired. Here the professor of Sacred Scripture, trained and experienced in the history, archeology, geography, and exegesis of the Old and New Testaments, may furnish valuable assistance.

Brief treatises in English of many parts of the Bible, principally the Old Testament, are still lacking—of Genesis, and especially its early chapters, of the Psalms, of the functions of the prophets, and of the period of the Kings. In the New Testament a simple but satisfying brochure on the Apocalypse still remains to be written. And fear need not be had of duplicating such publications, for the religious market could without any great loss be flooded with them, and their message would make the Bible live among our Catholic people.

A suitable biblical article in the diocesan paper every week, preferably on some topic relating to the special season, may furnish another source of scriptural knowledge to the leader and members of the Study Club. In this manner necessary information will be kept within the reach of the average purse.

The possibility of the importance that Sacred Scripture would play in the Discussion Study Club, and the far-reaching effect that through this Club it would have on our Catholic laity, is a thought that should stir the zeal of those interested in the Bible, and primarily of the Scripture professor. Father Fillion states that from the very beginning of his career as a teacher he steadily aimed at this ideal: "To make the Bible a little better known is to make it loved a great deal."[1] An opportunity is given us either directly or indirectly through our seminarians who will be their future guides to interest our Catholics in the Bible, to arouse their attention to its importance, beauty, and sacred character, to awaken in their minds a constant enthusiasm for God's message to man. We must remember that elementary courses in Scripture are not to be neglected; we must not confine our lectures to those of a university calibre. And through the Study Club, which offers these opportunities, many are waiting to be conducted into the inner sanctuary of the Bible.

As an incentive for our participation in this form of Catholic Action we have the immortal encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*. He recalls that all " 'scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice; that the man of God may be perfect, furnished to every good work.' That such was the purpose of God in giving the Scripture to men is shown by the example of Christ Our Lord and of His Apostles. For He himself who 'obtained authority by

[1] Fillion, *The Study of the Bible*, p. 287.

miracles, merited belief by authority, and by belief drew to Himself the multitude' was accustomed, in the exercise of His divine mission, to appeal to the Scriptures. He uses them at times to prove that He is sent by God, and is God Himself. From them He cites instructions for His disciples and confirmation of His doctrine. He vindicates them from the calumnies of objectors; He quotes them against the Sadducees and Pharisees and retorts from them upon Satan himself when he dares to tempt Him. At the close of His life His utterances are from the Holy Scripture, and it is the Scripture that He expounds to His disciples after His resurrection, until He ascends to the glory of his Father." This exhortation follows the expression of the desire of the Holy Father that he had for a long time wished to give an impulse to the noble science of Holy Scripture, and to impart to Scripture study a direction suitable to the needs of the present day. Among the needs of today to which the Bible must be directed is the Study Club.

In opening for our Catholic people the secrets of the Bible, they in their study and discussion of social and economic questions will give a proper place to the Bible. When they refute the political theory of Communism advocating the absolute supremacy of the State, they will hear the echoes of a divine voice which many years ago spoke a warning: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God, the things that are God's" (Mt. 22:21). Against the revolutionary tendencies of such a system they will quote the words of Jesus of Nazareth: "All that take the sword shall perish by the sword" (Mt. 26:52). The doctrine of the Gospel will make them appreciate the true philosophy of life, a philosophy given by God to Moses centuries ago amid the thunders of Sinai, and so unlike the rampant materialism of today that denies even the existence of God.

May we in aiding our Catholic people to a better knowledge of the Bible, and with the means at hand—the Discussion Study Club—give them the companionship of Jesus Christ, the heart of the Bible, so that they will be assisted, enlightened, and encouraged by Him through their knowledge of the Scriptures! Then they too will be able to say as did the two disciples of Emmaus: "Was not our heart burning within us, whilst He spoke in the way, and opened to us the Scriptures"? (Lk. 24:32.)

JOHN F. ROWAN

A RECENT LIFE OF CHRIST

Sir Thomas Henry Hall Caine was born at Runcorn, Cheshire, England, on May 14, 1853, and died in 1931. In the beginning he apparently intended to follow the profession of architect and was educated for this purpose. But later he turned to journalism, first in Liverpool and then in London. In 1885 his career as a novelist of the melodramatic type began. His success was immediate, and extraordinary from that time on for many years. Forty years ago he and Kipling were being read, discussed, and talked about throughout the English-speaking world as the foremost of English contemporary fiction writers.

Hall Caine had had a religious background, and as he grew older and more famous, he became concerned over the decline of religion and defections from the Church. Much of the blame for this situation he laid to the confusion of ideas and misunderstanding of different parts of the Bible. In his zeal he determined to do something to remedy the matter. Casting aside all authority and traditional opinions, he began to study the Sacred Writings himself, and especially the New Testament and the life of Christ as pictured therein. In order the better to fit himself for his task, he visited Palestine, travelled extensively in the Orient, read and studied translations of ancient documents, and, as his sons tell us in the Preface to this volume, made use of "all the available published material" relating to his immense theme.

We remember hearing many years ago that Hall Caine, then world famous and wealthy, had given up other pursuits and occupations for the sake of what he hoped would be his masterpiece—a Life of Christ.[1] On this subject he labored long and diligently. It is said that he read the whole Bible many times, and the Gospels more than one hundred times, besides copying them out with his own hand four or five times and devouring all the books and commentaries he could find on these New Testament writings. The World War interrupted his work for a time, but he again returned to it when the war was over; and, although he died without having published anything on the chosen subject of his later years, he left behind him in his own difficult penman-

[1] Life of Christ. By Hall Caine. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co. (1938), Pp. XXI, 1310. $3.50.

ship some three million words of commentary on the Bible and the person of Christ. It is out of this vast accumulation of material that his editors have produced the present large volume of 650,000 words.

With such a background and so much labor and zeal extending over many years, one might reasonably expect to find a finished work of unusual value. In fact, we had been looking forward to this Life of Christ by Hall Caine for a long time. But now, that it is finally published, we are sorry to have to say that the result is disappointing in the extreme. After all, a professional novelist seems hardly fitted by nature and by the requirements of his art for a work of this kind. Two years ago we discussed at some length in *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review* of New York (vol. 37, pp. 1028 ff.) a life of Christ by M. Mauriac, the famous French novelist, and what we said there applies here in part. Professional writers of fiction are, generally speaking, too much given to the imaginary for a serious work of this kind; they lack the solidity and breadth of learning, the spiritual outlook and sensitiveness, the broad sympathy and reverent attitude of mind and heart, which are necessary successfully to undertake and bring to fruitful completion a biography of Him who clothed Himself in our flesh and walked the ways of mortal life without ceasing to be the Divine Person "through whom the world was made" (Heb. 1:2).

We might observe, in the first place, that this work, instead of being a "Life of Christ," is rather a history of the whole Bible. It is even more than that, for it begins, like the Bible, with the creation of the world; it then leads down through a materialistic evolution that is taken for granted, through the Old Testament to the New, and finally comes to the life of Christ.

In the second place, we would suggest that the editors and publishers of this volume could have given it a title more in harmony with its contents if they had chosen for the purpose, "It Seems to Me." If in so doing, they should have encountered difficulties, legal or otherwise, with Heywood Broun, who has likely copyrighted this title for his perpetual daily column, they could have decided just as well on, "I Think"; for these two phrases run all through the work and are constantly used in place of good reasons, arguments, and proofs. Almost invariably when the author encounters passages in the Old or New Testaments

which seem to him conflicting or incapable of a natural and easy explanation, he will take refuge in the recurring refrain, "it seems to me," or "I think," and what he thinks is that the event in question never happened. That is his usual way of solving difficulties.

To Hall Caine such qualities of the Bible as inspiration, integrity, historical accuracy, and the like, mean nothing; they do not, and never did, exist. Countless examples of these and many other aberrations could easily be cited from this book, but it will be sufficient here to point out a few of them, taken more or less at random. Thus he says that the Bible, "as it comes down to us, consists mainly of a vast number of more or less circumstantial stories of God or gods, of kings and queens, of masters and servants, of the poor and the rich, of base and unworthy women, and of pure and noble ones. These stories are often told with a vividness and power which are without parallel in literature, but not rarely with amazing crudity and almost astounding insincerity" (p. 9). The Bible, he thinks, "is not an account of what God has said of Himself, but of what man, in the various stages of his spiritual development, has said about Him" (p. 10). He believes that Christ was not the Son of God in any divine sense, but that "He became a man of great wisdom, perhaps of great learning, certainly of great genius. As far as we can see He was a prophet taught by God, yet He preached no doctrine that was new to the world; He promulgated no new creed; He founded no new faith; He established no new Church; He made no religious organization; He authorized no sacraments or sacred writings; He recognized nc mysteries; He ordered no rites or ceremonies; on the contrary, He protested from first to last, against most or all of these" (p. vii).

The New Testament Scriptures, this author thinks, were originally written in Aramaic and afterwards translated into Greek (p. 5). The Gospels, as we have them, "were not written under the inspiration of God," nor are they "the work of the apostles whose names they bear" (p. 1289). Following the historical methods of writing in the first centuries, Caine tells us, "the writers of the Gospels often put into the mouth of Jesus words which it was impossible for them to say He had spoken" (p. 1289). He thinks there is nothing supernatural about the miraculous events narrated in the Old or New Testaments, be-

cause he says a miracle is only something whose cause is unknown, or unknowable, but "within the natural order" (pp. 615-640).

As regards the origin of our Gospels, this author thinks that soon after Our Lord's death the disciples "set down in writing all they could remember of His sayings, His sermons, and His parables." This writing was done by Matthew, since the other disciples were too illiterate to do it (pp. 290 ff.). After making this statement, the author proceeds, unabashed, to say on the same page that Mark was the author of the first written Gospel, composed either in Greek or Aramaic, either in Rome or in Caesarea. He thinks Mark wrote the recollections of Peter; and that later, between 58 and 60 A. D., came Luke's Gospel, written in Greek and using as materials Mark's Gospel and the book of "Sayings of Jesus" by Matthew (p. 1292). The Gospel by Matthew, he thinks, was written most likely in Aramaic some time after Luke, but without any use or knowledge of the latter. The Acts of the Apostles was written in Greek, partly by Luke, partly by others, between 64 and 68 A. D. (p. 1293). From these citations it seems, contrary to what the author had previously said about all the New Testament writings having appeared first in Aramaic, and having been written by Matthew since the other disciples were too ignorant to write, that a good portion of them were composed in Greek, and by some of those others who were so ignorant!

The Fourth Gospel, Caine thinks, was written between 90 and 100 A. D., but not by the Apostle St. John. In fact, he says he can find in it no trace of the beloved disciple (p. 1295). The writer of this Gospel, he believes, knew nothing about the Galilean ministry, or, if he did know it, he considered it of no importance. The Jesus of the Fourth Gospel "is totally unlike the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels" (pp. 1296 ff.). The author thinks the writer of the Fourth Gospel "was a Jewish-Christian living in Jerusalem, probably a Rabbi. I think this person was perhaps John the Presbyter, perhaps John of Ephesus.... Alternatively, I think the writer was a Gentile living in Alexandria" (p. 1298).

Briefly, Hall Caine considers the four Gospels a mass of contradictions, legends, folk-lore, and impossible yarns and stories of all kinds. For example, he finds it "impossible to regard the birth-stories in the Gospels as the records of actual happenings.

They are obviously conceived in the spirit of legend and written in the language of myth" (p. 1283). Matthew and Luke are a tissue of conflicting accounts and historical inaccuracies, and "when tradition attempts to harmonize these manifest contradictions, it makes confusion worse confounded" (pp. 1284, 1285).

We might continue these criticisims of this "Life of Christ" and citations from it for hundreds of pages, but what would be the use? Suffice it to say, that Hall Caine is a Rationalist of the rankest type, but altogether lacking anything like the erudition and scholarship of such men as Harnack, Jülicher, Holtzmann, B. Weiss, Renan, Loisy, and many others of the German, French, and English Rationalistic schools.

It is hard to see what good this book can possibly do. It contributes nothing to science, it is against all sane orthodoxy, it destroys reasonable faith, it serves only the spirit of scepticism, it has no special literary merit, it can do nothing but harm. The very title of the book and the author's name will give the work a wide circulation, and therefore spread the mischief it is bound to do. The writer had a good motive in undertaking this book, and he labored long and hard on it; but he was unfitted in every way for so great a task, and so his studies led him farther and farther astray, and away from his original intention. He set out to do good, but, as we see it, he has done only harm, and much of that.

Charles J. Callan, O.P.

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

II

1. Psalm 4:7-8. (Sunday, at Compline.)

Signatum est super nos lumen vultus tui, Domine: dedisti laetitiam in corde meo. *A fructu frumenti, vini, et olei sui, multiplicati sunt.*

One hardly thinks of a population as being increased in numbers by the mere abundance of its food-supply. Nor does this seem to be the original sense of verse 8. The Vulgate, however, derives its shortcomings from the Septuagint. Both witness to a Hebrew text (of this verse) identical with ours, but not well understood by the Alexandrian translators, who, by the time the Psalter had been reached, were no longer the same men who had more ably done the Pentateuch two or three generations earlier. They seem to have slipped twice in this sentence, and to have been miscopied in a third place. We may pass over the absence of "oil" from the Hebrew (which names only two products) and clear up the discrepancies in idiom.

First, it is "their corn" and "their must" (new vintage) which, the Hebrew says, "abounded" on one or another occasion. It is not the number of the producers.

Secondly, *a fructu* is due to a scribal error in the transmission of the Greek. The governing noun in the Hebrew means "time" understood as "occasion." This in Greek would be καιρός. But for ἀπὸ καιροῦ all codices of the LXX read ἀπὸ καρποῦ. The error must therefore be very early; yet error it is, and the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion all read ἀπὸ καιροῦ. It is "the time" or "occasion" of an abundant yield that is memorable. "The fruit of their corn" would be singular, and "the fruit of their must" unintelligible (unless as the same wine more fully aged).

Lastly, the Greek has rendered "from" too literally. In Hebrew this preposition serves as the sign of comparison, "beyond" or "more than," and such is commonly taken to be its meaning here.

The sentence therefore completes what precedes it. "Thou hast put joy in my heart, more than (at) the time (when) their corn and must [and oil] abounded." Of all temporal sources of

a sense of security, a rich harvest would be the greatest; the Psalmist feels more secure now (v. 9) than even on that joyous occasion.

2. Psalm 5:5. (Monday, at Lauds.)

Mane astabo tibi, *et videbo*: quoniam non Deus volens iniquitatem tu es.

"I will be present before Thee" is clear enough; but "I will see" would seem to be transitive, and the direct object which it expects or implies cannot be the Deity in whose presence the subject is to stand.

The explanation is simple. The second Hebrew verb can be rendered by *videbo,* but not so aptly here as by *exspectabo,* which really expresses its commoner force. Its participle, in fact, sometimes does duty as "watchman." It is equal to our "look out" or "be on the watch" (more positively so than *vigilare,* which is only "to be awake"). Thus the Psalmist is saying, "At dawn I will be present before Thee, and expectant," that is, of the favor of protection for which he is now praying.

3. Psalm 7:7b-8. (Monday, at Compline.)

Et exsurge, Domine, Deus meus, in praecepto quod mandasti, et synagoga populorum circumdabit te: *et propter hanc in altum regredere.*

There is doubt about the reading of 7b in the Hebrew, but the Vulgate's rendering of it is both possible and intelligible. The obscurity lies in *propter hanc in altum regredere.* However, its solution is mainly a matter of following the Psalmist's thought. God has commanded a judgment to take place; the peoples are now assembled; therefore, let the court be opened. The Hebrew word for *altum,* in its present absolute construction, regularly means "the height" of heaven. And this is God's throne (Ps. 10:4; 102:19). "On account of" the "assembly of peoples," let Him now "repair to the height" as the throne whence judgment should proceed.

4. Psalm 9:7c. (Sunday, at Matins.)

Periit memoria eorum *cum sonitu.*

Again the LXX. The Hebrew, after "the memory of them has perished," adds an emphatic pronoun: "(yes, of) them!" This form—which, strictly, need not be translated at all—would, in

the older unvocalized text, look much like a noun meaning "uproar," and so the Greek has taken it. Jerome translates "their memory has perished with themselves," thus acknowledging the true meaning of the added pronoun, while feeling the further need of a governing preposition. We may therefore regard *cum sonitu* as simply redundant to the sense.

5. Psalm 11:7b. (Tuesday, at Compline.)

Argentum igne examinatum, *probatum terrae,*
purgatum septuplum.

The obscure phrase appears in the LXX as δοκίμιον τῇ γῇ. "To the earth" is clear in the Hebrew, but the governing word is *hapax legomenon* and uncertain in meaning. Opinions differ here. Jerome, Fi., Ni., Bi. interpret *separatum a terra*; but the last explains by demanding considerable correction of the Hebrew, which, furthermore, would hardly use the present word "earth" as indicating the mere refuse or dross of a refining process. Most linguists take the uncertain word as "in the furnace" or "in the foundry" (the first letter being an inseparable preposition). Connecting this with *examinatum,* Zo. renders "tested in the foundry for the earth," i. e. for universal approval and acceptance. This seems satisfactory. Or with Ho. we may take *probatum* itself as the meaning of the uncertain Hebrew word, and render: "As silver refined by fire, approved for the world, seven times purged."

6. Psalm 13:3d. (Monday, at Matins.)

Contritio et infelicitas in viis eorum, et viam
pacis non cognoverunt.

Both Vulgate and LXX are without a Hebrew original in the last three fourths of this long verse. But the LXX's σύντριμμα elsewhere translates various Hebrew nouns meaning (a) "injury, hurt, pain," (b) "bruise, wound," (c) "breaking, fracture, cutting, breach, smash," (d) "violence, havoc, devastation, ruin." Hence the meaning is clearly that of physical dissolution, not of the collapse of self-will in the moral disposition which we call "contrition." On the contrary, "Destruction and misery are in their ways," or characterize their habitual conduct. Incidentally, *contritio* is one of the Vulgate's standard equivalents for physical injury or its effects; cf. Ps. 59:4; 146:3.

7. Psalm 15:3-4a. (Tuesday, at Compline.)

Sanctis, qui sunt in terra ejus, mirificavit omnes voluntates meas in eis. *Multiplicatae sunt infirmitates eorum, postea acceleraverunt.*

The passage suffers in both Greek and Latin from the terseness of the Hebrew in the latter sentence. Having, in the first two verses, avowed his exclusive devotion to Yahweh, the Psalmist continues (Hebr.): "Concerning saints that are on earth, and Thy noble ones, all my pleasure is in them." But in the next sentence his theme is a sharp antithesis: how little to be admired or imitated are idolators! Here we inherit from the Greek a triple root of obscurity, which makes "the saints" of the preceding verse suddenly seem unenviable after all.

First, *eorum* is the antecedent of a suppressed relative, the clause that follows being "asyndetic" (Joüon, *Grammaire*, 158*a*). A connective "who" is to be supplied as the actual subject of this sentence.

The next blind guide is *postea*, or rather its stronger Greek original. The Hebrew word does mean "after," but not "afterwards." It is, as often, an adjective, meaning "a second" or "another" of its kind or series. "Another god" is evident, especially from the context immediately following.

Finally, *acceleraverunt* is better exchanged (with lexicographers) for another Hebrew verb of the same radicals, meaning, not "hasten," but "acquire," particularly by the payment of a price. This verb is held to derive from the noun meaning "a dowry," and may thus transfer the notion of "espousing" a bride to depict the winning of some fancied divinity's favor by offerings.

The line then easily reads, "Their ills increase (who) espouse another (god)," and leads on naturally to what follows (Hebr.): "Their libations of blood I will not pour," etc.

(*To be continued*)

W. H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.

EXEGETICAL NOTES

THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE CRUCIFIXION

So well known in all its horror was death on the cross to the first Christians that they grasped at once all that was contained in the evangelists' brief statement, "They crucified him," and St. Paul's words. "He humbled himself.... even to the death of the cross." We too understand the frightfulness of that punishment but its full details do not live for us as they did for those early followers of Christ who could see daily outside the city gate brigands and slaves hanging dead or dying upon the tree of shame.

Pagan and Christian authors of the first centuries assume familiarity with this type of execution and speak of it only in a few passing words. But these tiny fragments gathered from many lands and many centuries, fitted together like the pieces of a mosaic, may restore the dim outlines of that picture of the crucifixion which St. Paul's eloquence painted for his hearers and which he recalled to their mind as the remedy for their waywardness: "O senseless Galatians, who hath bewitched you... before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been set forth, crucified among you?" (Gal. 3:1.)

The Persians probably originated the torture of the cross. From them the Romans adopted it *via* their deadly enemies the Carthaginians. But the Romans made it their own and employed it regularly throughout their whole world empire and it was by the hands of Roman soldiers that the "princes of this world ... crucified the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. 2:8).

Kinds of Crosses

What was the cross? Two principal forms merit our attention. One T-shaped, consisting of an upright beam to the top of which a horizontal beam was attached forming a letter T. The other familiar to us from art was dagger-shaped, the horizontal piece fitted at right angles into a socket of the upright about one quarter of the distance from the top. The upright pole alone was sometimes called the cross and the same Greek word can designate crucifying and impaling. The cross-bar was called the *patibulum.* The varying height of the vertical pole produced the low cross *(crux humilis)* and the high cross *(crux sublimis).* On a low cross the victim's feet would be raised 10 to 18 inches from the ground, on a high cross about a yard.

Low crosses were common. Criminals were crucified and so exposed to be devoured by the beasts, as was Blandina, the heroic woman martyr of Lyons in France. A popular Roman play of the first century A.D. represented a famous robber hanging on a cross, devoured by

beasts. It was this drama the Emperor Caligula attended just before his death. As he left the theatre and entered the corridor of his palace he was assassinated.

But authors refer also to the high cross. When the heroic Roman Regulus was crucified at Carthage he could look out from on high towards his beloved Rome. In Tarragona, Spain, Caesar Galba ordered the soldiers to crucify a man. As the accused protested his Roman citizenship, Galba commanded the soldiers to give him a cross higher than the rest and painted white for good measure. Our Lord's words "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself" (Jn. 12:32) suggest a high cross.

Upon the upright beam of the cross a small piece of wood projecting at right angles formed a seat for the person crucified. St. Justin mentions the wood fixed to the center like a horn upon which the victim is seated. St. Irenaeus speaks of the five extremities of the cross, two in the length, two in the width and one in the center upon which the crucified rests. Both are second century witnesses. A contemporary of St. Paul, Seneca, expresses his longing for life, even a life seated upon the sharp cross. No doubt medical reasons dictated the use of such a support. The footrest has not such early documentation, but some support would be needed to take the dead weight from the nailed hands. During the filming of the *King of Kings* some years ago I understand the cross was furnished with a small seat.

In attaching the victim to his cross nails or ropes were used. A statement of Tertullian gave rise to the opinion that no one but Our Lord was ever nailed to the cross. Painting and drama, the Oberammergau Passion Play for instance, represent Jesus nailed, but the robbers tied to their crosses. However nailing did occur. One expression used for crucifying by Greek authors and Josephus means "to nail." Apuleius, a writer of the second century A. D., mentions a sorceress using "the nails with lumps of flesh of such as were hanged" (*Metamorphoses* 3,17; tr. Wadlington-S. Gaselee. Loeb Library, p. 127).

CRIMES PUNISHABLE BY CRUCIFIXION

By Roman law what culprits were condemned to the cross? They were especially robbers, and in war deserters, traitors, and rebels. Judea experienced many insurrections and their bloody sequel. Suppressing a rebellion which broke out at the death of Herod the Great (4 B.C.), the Roman Legate Quintilius Varus crucified 2,000. Gessius Florus, the Roman Procurator of Judea (64-66), whose cruelty precipitated the revolt which brought about the destruction of Jerusalem, had Jews who were Roman citizens and even of the rank of knights scourged and nailed to the cross before his tribunal. During the siege of Jerusalem by Titus sometimes 500 Jews were captured and

crucified daily before the walls of the city. The soldiers in their fury and mockery crucified them one in one positon and another in another until crosses were lacking for the victims and wood was lacking for the crosses.

The cross was preeminently a slave punishment. So Cicero speaks: "Even if we are threatened with death, we may die free men. But the executioner, the veiling of the head, and the very word 'cross' should be far removed not only from the person of a Roman citizen but from his thoughts, his eyes, and his ears. For it is not only the actual occurrence of these things or the endurance of them, but the liability to them, the expectation, nay the mere mention of them, that is unworthy of a Roman citizen and a free man" (*Defence of Rabirius,* 5, 16. tr. H. Grose Hodge. Loeb Library, p. 467). However, at least in later times some Roman citizens were crucified. The general rule would be that this penalty was inflicted only upon citizens of the provinces and the poorer classes.

Slave rebellions ended in every slave captured being crucified. Spartacus, whose speech to the gladiators is so familiar, led a revolt which threatened the Roman state 73-71 B.C. Pompey crushed the uprising, capturing and crucifying 6,000, and the road from Capua to Rome was lined with their crosses. A master of the house had power of life and death over his slaves and could scourge them even to death or crucify them without interference from the civil authority. Cicero mentions the case of a slave being crucified whose tongue was cut out first to prevent him from revealing any secrets. The early custom was that if the master was murdered and the murderer unknown all the slaves of the household would be crucified.

THE PROCESS OF CRUCIFIXION

The method of crucifixion included scourging, and the carrying of the cross to the place of execution, where the culprit was hung upon it to remain until death. Scourging, a punishment distinct in itself, not usually inflicted upon Roman citizens, was also the ordinary prelude to graver punishments. The scourging took place either when the person was bound to a low cross or beforehand. Usually the soldiers beat the condemned with scourges as he was led to the place of death.

The title, a piece of wood covered with white gypsum, on which the crime was written in black letters, was usually carried before the condemned person so that the bystanders could know the reason for his death. (Cf. W. A. Brown in Hastings *Dict. Bibl.* I p. 529.) Eusebius gives an instance: "This is Attalus, a Christian."

What is meant by carrying the cross? Greek and Rabbinic writers use this phrase but the older Latin writers mention carrying the *pati-*

bulum or cross-bar. "Carrying the cross" may be a figure of synecdoche. Plautus in his comedies indicates that the slave carried the *patibulum* to the place of execution and there ascended the cross. Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes a slave led to crucifixion. He was handed over to his fellow slaves to be made a mockery and laughingstock, his hands stretched out and tied to the *patibulum* laid across his shoulders, then driven along with rods. Compare with this picture Our Lord's words to St. Peter: "When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands and another shall gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldst not. And this he said signifying by what death he should glorify God" (Jn. 21:18-19). St. Peter was crucified.

Other texts seem to indicate the cross, i. e., the upright beam as fixed in the ground permanently and the crucified as lifted up to the cross. These citations have led some to conclude that the entire cross was erected first, the criminal then hoisted up and nailed to it. So Knabenbauer, Belser, and Cardinal Innitzer. Finally, those who favor the opinion that Our Lord carried only the cross-bar argue it would be difficult even for a strong man to carry a heavy cross 12 feet high. If the weight even of the small cross-bar proved too much for Our Savior's strength, it would clearly indicate his utter weakness at the very beginning of the Way of the Cross.

Fastening to the cross by ropes would be simple. If nails were used either the nailing would occur as depicted generally, i. e., the whole cross laid upon the ground; or if the *patibulum* alone were carried the hands would be nailed to the *patibulum* on the ground, then this piece with the victim dangling from it would be lifted up by means of ladders and forked poles *(furcillae)*, fitted into the socket of the upright beam, and finally the feet nailed.

Those crucified sometimes lived a day and a night. Josephus during the siege of Jerusalem discovered three of his friends hanging on their crosses. He obtained permission from Titus to have them taken down. Under medical care one recovered, the other two died. In order to hasten death different means were adopted, the ordinary being breaking of the legs. This also constituted a distinct Roman penalty. In the 1934 Oberammergau Passion Play one of the robbers played his part so realistically at the breaking of the legs that he seemed to collapse utterly.

Early Roman procedure entailed the bodies remaining upon the cross until they rotted and fell off, or were eaten up by vultures. In Cicero's time this practice had been mitigated, so that friends could obtain permission to remove and bury the corpse. Philo, the Jewish philosopher, complained that Flaccus, Prefect of Egypt, in 38 A.D. refused to allow the bodies of Jews who had been crucified to be taken down from the cross.

THE GOSPEL ACCOUNT

From these data what conclusions can be drawn concerning the crucifixion of Our Lord? First, the charge against him of sedition ordinarily carried with it the penalty of the cross. "He hath stirred up the people.... He made himself king," the Jews charged. Pilate, though convinced of his innocence, accepted the accusation when he wrote the title "Jesus of Nazareth, king of the Jews."

The scourging Pilate first intended as a sop to the Jews, a distinct penalty to substitute for the crucifixion. St. Luke gives Pilate's words: "I find no cause in him. I will chastise him therefore, and let him go" (Lk. 23:22). And St. John narrates that Pilate had Our Lord scourged, then brought forth to the people: "Behold I bring him forth unto you, that you may know that I find no cause in him" (Jn. 19:1-4). When due to the people's insistence Pilate finally granted the crucifixion, some think he would order another scourging as the beginning of the usual crucifixion process, but others hold, and with more likelihood, that he would consider the scourging already inflicted as sufficient. The mockery of the soldiers is not surprising. The crowning with thorns was unusual. However Pilate had given him over to them for punishment, and he would hardly be shocked at this cruelty. Elsewhere St. Luke tells us of "the Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices" (Lk. 13:1).

The carrying of the cross presents one of the most disputed problems. Catholic authors are divided, some thinking Our Lord carried the cross-bar only, others the entire cross, the weight of authority slightly favoring the former opinion. One unusual detail is that though by Roman custom the victim went to the place of execution naked, Our Lord was led forth to Calvary fully clothed. Matthew and Mark are explicit: "And after they had mocked him, they took off the cloak from him and put on his own garments, and led him away to crucify him" (Mt. 27:31; cf. Mk. 15:20). The Romans in many matters adapted themselves to local customs. Perhaps this exception was a concession to Jewish modesty. The same reason may have prompted the soldiers to permit a loin cloth to be worn upon the cross.

The cross was a high one. When the soldier wished to reach Our Lord a sponge dipped in vinegar he put it upon a reed according to the ordinary text, though some, including Fr. Lagrange, O. P., prefer to read spear—the Greek words for spear *(hysso)* and reed or hyssop *(hyssopo)* being similar. The Fathers from their comparisons evidently understood the cross to be dagger-shaped with the upright projecting above the cross-bar. Some confirmation for this opinion may be found in the fact that the title was fastened above Our Lord's head.

Jesus' hands and feet were not tied with ropes but nailed. The risen Christ acceded to Thomas' demand to see the print of the nails (Jn. 20:25-27), and to all the Apostles he said: "See my hands and feet, that it is I myself, handle and see" (Lk. 24:39). From the different opinions about the carrying of the cross or merely the cross-bar, authors dispute how he was nailed. Ordinarily artists picture the hands and feet fixed to the entire cross lying on the ground. A few presuppose the whole cross erected previously as in a painting by Fra Angelico in San Marco's, Florence (Cf. Holzmeister, *Crux Domini*, p. 29. n. 7). Others believe only the hands were nailed to the cross-bar on the ground.

After a few hours on the cross Our Lord died. Pilate expressed surprise. However the previous sleepless night of the trials, the loss of blood in the Agony of Gethsemani and the scourging would easily explain Our Savior's weakness. The soldiers removed all doubt by piercing his side. Pilate's granting permission to bury the body accords with the Roman custom of that time.

This brief résumé, it is hoped, will show why the crucifixion of Christ so horrified even well-disposed pagans and why Christians were taunted with the disgrace of having such a God. Even after Constantine gave peace to the Church, Christian art only gradually overcame the repugnance to realistic representations of the death on the cross. At first the cross was represented as studded with jewels but without the body of Christ. When the penalty of crucifixion had died out of the memory of men as a living punishment, the figure hanging upon the cross became common.

The shame and the glory of the cross no one has described better than St. Paul writing to the Corinthians less than 25 years after Our Lord's death. "Both the Jews require signs, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ *crucified*, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block and unto the Gentiles foolishness: but unto them that are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Cor. 1:22-24).

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

W. Brown, in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible*, I p. 528-9.

Urbanus Holzmeister, *Crux Domini atque Crucifixio, quomodo ex archæologia romana illustrentur.* Romae, e Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1934. Pp. 32.

H. Leclerq, *Dict. d'Archéologie*, 3, 3045-3131.

H. Marucchi, *Dict. de la Bible* 2, 1127-1134.

H. Marucchi-Vecchierello, *Manual of Christian Archeology*, St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J., (1935) 315-8.

J. Sauer, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, VI, 242-254.

E. Saglio, in Saglio-Daremberg, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, I, 2, 1573-1575.

JOHN J. COLLINS, S.J.

PROBLEMS IN BIBLE REVISION

DIFFICULTIES IN TRANSLATING ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL

It is often said that the best commentary is a good translation. Whether this thought is to be accepted without reservation may be a question. At least it expresses well the duty of the translator, whose office it is first of all to grasp the sense of the original, and then to turn this sense accurately into the vernacular. The version of a particular phrase in the original will not infrequently depend upon the meaning given it. The following instances from the Prologue to St. John's Gospel will illustrate what this implies.

Jn. 1:5 And the light shines in the darkness;
and the darkness *understood it not.*[1]

Maldonatus has remarked that this verse might be clearer if no one had attempted to interpret it, for what is clear in itself has been made difficult by the variety of meanings attached to it. The difficulty does not lie in the general thought which the Evangelist wishes to convey. The Light from the beginning has been shining in the Darkness. This Light represents the Word's intervention in the course of the world's spiritual history. Further, there is opposition between the Light and the Darkness. Something of the same idea is reflected in Ps. 9:16f where it is said that God is made known, or makes Himself known, by His judgments.

Opinion, however, varies in the interpretation of the opposition between the Light and the Darkness in this instance. Some take it to mean that in this conflict the Darkness failed to overcome or overtake the Light. Others hold that the Darkness did not comprehend or understand the Light. Before he can render the verse in English, the translator must make choice of these views.

The first interpretation is followed in most modern English versions of the New Testament.[2] These are taken from the Greek text. Now it is true that the verb *καταλαμβάνω* means radically to "take hold of," or "seize." This root meaning will, of course, vary with the context. St. John used this verb in the sense of "arrest" (8:3-4), and also in the sense of "overtake" (12:35). The Latin term, *comprehendo*, is

[1] Vg.: *non comprehenderunt; οὐ κατέλαβεν.*

[2] Moffatt: "did not master it."
Twentieth Century: "never overpowered it."
Goodspeed: "has never put it out."
Westminster: "hath overcome it not."

employed in the Vulgate in both of these senses.[3] If, therefore, we were restricted to the fundamental meaning of καταλαμβάνω, or to one of the meanings of *comprehendo*, there would be room for no other version.

But there is much to be said for the other interpretation. It appears to be favored by vv. 10-11: "He was in the world.... and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not." It is the more natural sense of the figure which St. John is using. Maldonatus reminds us that light and darkness are incompatible, that they cannot exist together in the one place. The failure of the Darkness to comprehend the Light is closer to this exclusiveness than its failure to overcome the Light.

Further, the language of the text will easily admit the version we have adopted. Καταλαμβάνω can mean "take hold of intellectually," and hence "understand." It is employed in this way in Acts.[4] The Latin *comprehendo* in this sense needs no support.

Jn. 1:15 John bore witness concerning him,
and cried, "This was he of whom I said,
'He who is to come after me
has been made above me,
because he was before me.'" (Cf. Jn. 1:30.)[5]

The meaning of this testimony of the Baptist admits of little doubt. It is the same as that given by him on another occasion under the image of the bridegroom showing his superiority over the friend of the bridegroom. At that time he said, "He must increase, but I must decrease" (Jn. 3:28-30). The thought, therefore, is plainly indicative of Christ's outranking the Baptist. The Evangelist adds this testimony to his prologue perhaps for two reasons. First, it confirms his own declaration of Christ's preexistence. Second, it shows the superiority of Christ over the Baptist, as in vv. 8-9. Still there is question of how this should be represented in English.

The version adopted here, "has been made above me," is close to the Latin, where *ante* is understood of rank and not of time. It is objected that "made" appears to depreciate the nature of Christ in a context which aims at declaring His full divinity. But the term is not "made" but "made above." The same translation is given to γίνομαι in 1:14;

[3] Cf. Jn. 12:35; 18:12; Acts 1:16.

[4] Cf. Acts 4:13; 10:34; 25:25. For these terms the Latin in each case has *comperi*. The term *comprehendo* is not employed for "understand" in the Vg., with the exception of Jn. 1:5; the fact is interesting in view of our translation, but should not be urged against the above evidences.

[5] Vg.: *ante me factus est;* ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν

and it seems to cause no difficulty. The main objection to the present translation will come from its imperfect reflection of the tense of the verb in the original. There the perfect tense indicates a past action whose effect is mainly attended to in the present. This would be shown best by the English present tense. The verb γίνομαι brings to mind either "being" or "becoming." This is the usual turn given the phrase in modern versions.[6] The thought is adequately given either as "he is above me," or "he is made above me."

Jn. 1:16 And of his fullness
we have all received,
grace for grace.[7]

A variety of meanings has been found in the words "grace for grace." 1) One group of opinions rests on the notion of "substitution." The grace of the Gospel replaces that of the Law; the gift of the Holy Ghost for that of Christ's corporeal presence. 2) Another group centers round the thought of "succession," admitting of accumulation and abundance. Maldonatus took it to mean a succession of graces varying in degree. Generally the ἀντί is taken as support for this concept. (Cf. citation from Philo in Lagrange, Comm. *hoc loco.*) The sense is very acceptable, especially when understood not merely of a succession of graces, but of gifts increasing and accumulating. 3) But there is another interpretation which should not be excluded. This associates more intimately the two parts of the verse, and considers that our grace is abundant because it is a participation in the "fullness of Christ."

The first interpretation is difficult, and the contrast between grace and law (in v. 17) seems to play no part here. The other two have in common the thought of "abundance." We are reminded in this connection of the employment of the idea in St. Paul. He wrote to the Ephesians and the Colossians, assuring them of the fullness of grace in Christ (the first part of our verse), and arguing that we have access to that fullness (the second part of our verse).[8]

In our translation *et* (καί), being epexegetic, is omitted. "Grace for grace" appears to have the advantage of showing the "abundance" of the gift, without excluding the thought of "participation," or the

[6] Moffatt: "has taken precedence of me."
Twentieth Century: "is now before me."
Goodspeed: "is now ahead of me."
Westminster: "hath come to be above me."

[7] Vg.: *et gratiam pro gratia;* καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος.

[8] Cf. Ephes. 1:23; 3:19; 4:13; Col. 1:19; 2:9.

source of the gift. The reading in the Westminster version, "grace on grace" (also in Knabenbauer), attends more to "abundance." The other modern versions insist rather too much on the "succession" of graces.[9] This is not the primary meaning, however well supported by this sense of *ἀντί*.

Jn. 1:18 No one has at any time seen God.
The only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father,
he has revealed him.[10]

Again, the general meaning of the verse is clear. Christ is the perfect manifestation of God to man. The difficulty is in the sense of the terms used in the Latin and Greek texts.

In the Vulgate, *enarro* gives accurately the Greek *ἐξηγέομαι*. These terms mean first of all "to relate," "to recount." They have also the same usage for "to explain." The sense of the verse, therefore, is "he explained him." But from the exposition of this thought in the Gospel itself, we are carried into the manner of Christ's explanation of the Father. This is no less than identification of Himself with the Father. This is very clear in 14:9, "Philip, he who sees me sees also the Father." The work of the Word, therefore, is not merely an explanation of God, but a manifestation of Him in His person. The term "reveal" is an attempt, in our translation, to represent this revelation of God in the earthly appearance of the Word.

WILLIAM L. NEWTON

"FIDELIS, FAITHFUL."

In the delicate task of expressing the Latin of the New Testament in the English of our own time, a word which began its career as a standard translation, and has long maintained its place as such, may now at length demand replacement by several synonyms in different contexts, in order to express their various shades of thought. One such instance meets us in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul (1 and 2 Timothy and Titus). The Greek adjective *πιστός*, occurring 17 times in these three Letters, has long enjoyed an unvarying translation in Latin and English, as the following table will show at a glance:

[9] Moffatt: "grace after grace."
Twentieth Century: "gift after gift of love."
Goodspeed: "blessing after blessing."

[10] Vg.: ... *ipse enarravit;* *ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.*

	Greek		*Vulgate*		*Rheims (1582)*	*Challoner (1750)*
1 Tim. 1:12	πιστός		*fidelis*		faithful	faithful
15	"		"		"	"
3:1	"		"		"	"
11	"	(plural)	"	(plural)	"	"
4:3	"	"	"	"	"	"
9	"		"		"	"
10	"	(plural)	"	(plural)	"	"
12	"	"	"	"	"	"
5:16	"		"		"	"
6:2	"	(plural)	"	(plural)	"	believing
2	"	"	"	"	"	faithful
2 Tim. 2:2	"	"	"	"	"	"
11	"		"		"	"
13	"		"		"	"
Titus 1:6	"	(plural)	"	(plural)	"	"
9	"		"		"	"
3:8	"		"		"	"

Challoner's single change of "faithful" to "believing" rests mainly on the actual reason which demands still further changes now. In classical Greek πιστός commonly retains its original passive force of "faithful" as "sincere, trusty, sure, worthy of reliance, true." But besides this meaning in the New Testament and in early Christian literature, "faithful" often has the active force of "believing, trusting, relying on." Naturally, when the adjective in this sense serves as a noun, "a faithful one" is simply "a believer, a Christian."

This active use of the word, in Biblical Greek and Latin alike, is acknowledged by standard lexicographers. Furthermore, it seems to have become the more frequent meaning of the two. "Faithful" in our modern usage, especially in matters religious, is more apt to express "believing" than "trustworthy." This gradual displacement of a passive by an active sense has already influenced English versions in several passages. In other writings of St. Paul than the Pastoral Epistles, our own current version (derived from Challoner) departs from the use of "faithful" several times; while the Westminster

Version of England uses "believing" or "believer" in five instances within the Pastorals themselves.

With the sanction of such authority for some compliance with present needs, it has been felt that a clearer expression of St. Paul's meaning might be secured if the conventional word "faithful" were replaced by the following synonyms in their respective contexts:

(1) *Trustworthy* in 1 Tim. 1:12 and 2 Tim. 2:2. In the first, St. Paul is mentioned as one found reliable for the apostolic ministry; in the second, he asks for men who can be trusted to hand on his teaching unchanged.

(2) *Believer* in 1 Tim. 4:10; 5:16; 6:2 (twice); and *believing* in Titus 1:6. In all these passages adherence to the Faith is denoted, Christians being distinguished from others of their class or age.

(3) *True* in 1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim. 2:11; Titus 1:9; 3:8. Here, as in the case of "trustworthy" above, we have to express the passive force of the Greek adjective and its Latin equivalent, but no longer as predicated of persons. The subject of all these passages is a "saying" or "statement" of some truth, usually dogmatic.

In the four remaining passages of the Pastoral Epistles, the current translation "faithful" is apt enough, and has accordingly been retained.

LEO P. FOLEY, C.M.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL CORNER

ASIONGABER (Ezion-geber)

Tell el-Kheleifeh is an inconspicuous ruin, situated about a third of a mile from the northern shore of the Gulf of Aqabah. It was discovered by the German explorer, Fritz Frank, during his investigation of this region in 1932-34. Frank proposed the identification with the long-sought Asiongaber, Solomon's port on the Red Sea in the land of Edom (3 Kgs. 9:26; 2 Par. 8:17). Subsequently, the site was examined by Dr. Nelson Glueck of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem. The numerous fragments of pottery scattered over the surface of the Tell indicated a site belonging to Iron Age I (1200-600 B.C.), and the excavation undertaken by Dr. Glueck last spring revealed nothing earlier than the eleventh century, nor later than the seventh. Before making known his own conclusions, Dr. Glueck submitted his materials separately to Dr. Clarence Fisher and to Père Hugues Vincent, O.P., and *mirabili dictu* all three were found in agreement. It is indeed an event when three eminent Palestinian archæologists arrive at the same conclusion independently.

Although nothing has been discovered as yet which would definitely identify the site with the biblical Asiongaber, it is quite evident that the place must have been an important industrial and commercial center in Solomonic times. The largest building unearthed thus far was a copper refinery with ten furnace rooms. Its long row of double flues was placed advantageously in reference to the strong winds which blow constantly from the north in this region. Finished objects of copper, such as nails, fishhooks, spearheads, and dishes were also uncovered. In addition, there was a large variety of other objects, indicating extensive commercial activities with distant places. Writing is represented in seals and inscribed jar and bowl handles. With the exception of a piece in South Arabic characters of the eighth century, the writing is in the old Hebrew script. One of the inscriptions has been interpreted as reading: "Belonging to Qosanal, the Servant (or Officer) of the King." Further excavation on this site will be awaited with interest.

If Tell el-Kheleifeh proves to be Asiongaber, then Ailath (Elath or Eloth) should be found somewhere near. Both Asiongaber and Ailath are mentioned in the Scriptures not only in connection with Solomon and later kings, but also in connection with the Exodus under Moses several centuries earlier (Num. 33:35; Deut. 2:8). If El-Paran (Gen. 14:6) and Ela (Gen. 36:41) are to be identified with Ailath, then Ailath at least must date back still earlier to patriarchal times. Thus far, the available evidence at Tell el-Kheleifeh indicates no occupation

before the eleventh century B.C. It must be remembered, however, that only the northern, industrial section of the site has been excavated. Indications of an earlier occupation may yet be found within the Tell, two-thirds of which still awaits excavation.

LACHIS (Lachish)

Tell ed-Duweir is an imposing mound, situated in the foothills (Shephelah) northeast of Gaza and west of Hebron. Its identification with the Biblical Lachis was first suggested in 1929 by Dr. W. F. Albright, and his opinion has been confirmed by the Wellcome-Marston Research Expedition to the Near East, which has been excavating the site since 1932 under the able direction of Mr. J. L. Starkey. Previously, Tell el-Hesi, excavated by Petrie and Bliss, was thought to be Lachis.

The excavations of Tell ed-Duweir proved interesting from the very beginning. On top of the mound were found the remains of government buildings dating from the Persian period (6th-4th centuries B.C.), the only examples of large constructions from this period thus far discovered in Palestine. In the upper strata of the mound were found indications of two successive conflagrations in the early sixth century. These, no doubt, are to be connected with the campaigns of Nabuchodonosor against Juda in 597 and 589 B.C. (4 Kgs. 24:10 ff.; 25:1 ff.; Jer. 34:7). In the debris of the second conflagration, Mr. Starkey found eighteen broken pieces of pottery, inscribed with carbon-iron ink. The language is the Hebrew of Jeremias's time, and the writing is in a cursive form of the ancient Phoenician-Hebrew script, with some striking similarities to the writing on the Samaritan ostraca, which are at least two centuries earlier. The Lachish Letters, as they are now called, are for the most part a series of letters sent within a short space of time by a certain Hoshaah to his Lord Yaosh, apparently the commanding officer of Lachis. The letters are difficult to read, and it may be some time before scholars are able to establish their text definitely.

Excavation on this site has also revealed evidence regarding Sennacherib's campaign of 700 B.C. (4 Kgs. 18:13 ff., Isa. 36:1 ff.). Near the city gate was found a pit, in which were the charred bones of some 1500 people, most probably warriors who perished in the siege of the city. Many of the skulls show head injuries, and there are a number of examples of crude attempts at the operation known as trephining.

Of interest also is the evidence for the destruction of the Canaanite Lachish by the forces of Josue (Jos. 10:32). In the debris of this strata was found a broken bowl with Egyptian writing upon it. The bowl had been used as a memorandum to record deliveries of wheat.

If the inscription "In the fourth year" refers to the fourth year of the Pharaoh Merneptah, as Dr. Albright and others believe, the conquest of Lachis by Josue would have occurred after 1231 B.C. This would be additional evidence for the later date of Josue's conquest. Mr. John Garstang, on the evidence of his excavations at Jericho, places the destruction of that city by Josue about 1400 B.C., while Père Vincent puts it about 1250 B.C. Perhaps Lachis will yet produce conclusive evidence regarding the matter. Mr. Starkey was murdered by Arabs at Hebron on January 10, 1938, and excavations have been suspended for the time being. In the meantime, scholars will be busy with the Lachis Letters. An elaborate edition has been brought out by Dr. H. Torczyner, but many of his readings and translations have been questioned.

RAS SHAMRA

In 1929, the French archæologists, MM. C. F. A. Schaeffer and G. Chenet, discovered at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) in North Syria several hundred tablets in an unknown cuneiform script. M. Ch. Virolleaud published 48 of them immediately in *Syria*. The small number of signs seemed to indicate the presence of alphabetical writing rather than syllabic. It is now known that the alphabet consists of 29 signs, and that the language is Semitic, with some close resemblances to to Biblical Hebrew. The tablets date from the fourteenth century B.C., or earlier.

Within two years, Professor Hans Bauer and Professor E. Dhorme deciphered most of the signs, while Professors Virolleaud, Albright, Ginsberg, and others have done real pioneer work in bringing the knowledge of this new language (or dialect) toward perfection. The tablets are being published gradually in *Syria*, while M. Virolleud is preparing an edition under the title, *Mission de Ras-Shamra*. Two volumes have appeared thus far.

The longest texts are mythological poems describing the doings of Semitic gods and goddesses. There are also letters, commercial documents, ritual specifications, etc. Much, of course, is still obscure. The philologist will probably profit most by the new discoveries, and indirectly the Old Testament scholar.

E. A. CERNY, S.S.

BIBLICAL NEWS

The Editorial Board of the Catholic Biblical Association of America for the Revision of the New Testament met Sunday, January 15, at the Sulpician Seminary, Washington, D. C. The Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, Bishop of Great Falls, Montana, presided at the meeting.

The first part of the meeting was devoted to the forthcoming Revision of the New Testament. The Editorial Board received an international character with the appointment of two eminent English scholars, the Very Rev. Monsignor John Macintosh Tilney Barton and the Rev. Dr. Cuthbert Lattey, S. J. Besides these, three new editors were appointed for the purpose of assisting in reviewing the text: the Rev. Dr. William L. Newton, of Catholic University, the Rev. Dr. Edward A. Cerny, S. S., of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md., and Rev. Dr. Charles J. Costello, O. M. I., of the Oblate Scholasticate, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Newton presented an analysis of the comments and criticisms received on the recently printed text and commentary of St. John's Gospel. In general the work was very well received both in this country and abroad. At the same time, further suggestions regarding the improvement of the text and format of the entire work were discussed and accepted.

Within a few months the individuals who acted as revisors for the New Testament will receive their manuscripts with the suggestions and criticisms of the Editorial Board. Each revisor will again review his own work and re-submit it to the Editorial Board. At the same time he is asked to add the necessary cross references and parallel passages pertaining to his work. However, these should not be too numerous. It is hoped that the remaining manuscripts will be re-submitted to the Editorial Board by September at the latest. Thereafter the material will again pass through the hands of the Editors and finally be prepared for publication.

The second part of the meeting was devoted to the Revision of the Old Testament. The principles governing this work were again discussed and finally accepted with a few minor changes. At the same time, twenty-eight members of the Association were appointed to act as revisors. In view of the vast proportions of this work, no definite date has been set as yet for its completion. Many, however, have already done some work on the portion assigned to them. More definite information regarding the progress of this work will be given towards the end of this year.

The following were appointed to constitute the Editorial Board for the Revision of the Old Testament: the Rev. Dr. Edward Arbez, S. S., Sulpician Seminary, Washington, D. C.; the Very Rev. Dr. Thomas

H. Plassman, O. F. M., president of St. Bonaventure's College, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.; the Rev. Dr. William H. McClellan, S. J., of Woodstock College, Maryland; the Rev. Dr. W. S. Reilly, S. S., of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore; the Rev. Dr. William L. Newton, of the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.; the Rev. Dr. E. H. Donzé, S. M., Marist Seminary, Washington, D. C.; the Rev. Dr. John E. Steinmueller, Seminary of the Immaculate Conception, Huntington, Long Island, N. Y.; the Very Rev. Dr. Charles J. Callan, O. P., and the Very Rev. Dr. John A. McHugh, O. P. of Hawthorne, N. Y.; and the Rev. Charles H. Pickar, O. S. A., Augustinian College, Washington, D. C.

The Pontifical Biblical Commission has issued the following notice concerning prizes to be awarded by it:

During the year 1939 two prizes of $100 each will be awarded by the Pontifical Biblical Commission for dissertations written on the following biblical subjects:

1. For first prize—"Did St. Ignatius of Antioch know the Fourth Gospel?"

Both the text of the Fourth Gospel and that of St. Ignatius must be cited in Greek.

2. For second prize—"Charity towards our Neighbor in the Old Testament."

All those and only those may compete for the first prize, who are enrolled as students of the theological course in any Major Seminary.

But all those and only those may compete for the second prize, who attend the classes of any theological Faculty or School, which has the right of conferring academic degrees.

The dissertations may be written in Latin, English, French, German, Spanish, or Italian; but they must be type-written.

The name of the author is to be indicated not on the dissertation itself, but on a separate folio together with the name of the Seminary or Faculty or School, of which the author is a student, and the signature of the Rector or Professor of Sacred Scripture. This signed folio shall bear the title of the subject (to be repeated in the beginning of the dissertation), and together with the dissertation itself is to be sent to Rome to the Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission before October 31, 1939.

Their Eminences, the Cardinals in charge of the Biblical Commission, will determine the distribution of the prizes, according to the balloting of the Very Reverend Consultors of the same. Where it is necessary, the aforesaid prizes will be awarded equally or proportionately to two contestants.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

THE ASSOCIATION'S MEMBERSHIP ROLL

PATRONS

His Eminence, William Cardinal O'Connell, Archbishop of Boston
His Eminence, Patrick Cardinal Hayes (Deceased), Archbishop of New York

Their Excellencies
Most Reverend Michael J. Curley, D. D., Archbishop of Baltimore
Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, O.P., S.T.M., Archbishop of Cincinnati
Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, S.T.D., Bishop of Brooklyn
Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D., Bishop of Great Falls

Rev. Edward P. Graham, LL.D., Canton, Ohio

LIFE MEMBERS

Their Excellencies
Most Reverend John J. Glennon, S.T.D., Archbishop of St. Louis
Most Reverend John J. Mitty, D.D., Archbishop of San Francisco
Most Reverend James E. Cassidy, D. D., Bishop of Fall River
Most Reverend Alexander McGavick, D.D., Bishop of La Crosse
Most Reverend Joseph Schrembs, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland
Most Reverend Anthony J. Schuler, S.J., D.D., Bishop of El Paso
Most Reverend Gerald Shaughnessy, S.M., S.T.D., Bishop of Seattle

Right Rev. Msgr. Michael D. Leahy, Lakewood, Ohio
Rev. Conrad Lutz, Franklin Square, L. I., N. Y.
St. Edward's Seminary, Kenmore, University Station, Seattle, Wash.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Among the Associate Members are listed those who have made application for active membership but who have not yet been presented to a general meeting for election according to Const. Art. IV, By-Laws 7c.

Their Excellencies
Most Reverend Francis J. Beckman, D.D., Archbishop of Dubuque
Most Reverend John J. Cantwell, D.D., Archbishop of Los Angeles
Most Reverend J. A. Floersh, Archbishop of Louisville
Most Reverend Rudolph A. Gerken, D.D., Archbishop of Santa Fe
Most Reverend Dr. Mar Ivanios, O.I.C., M.A., Archbishop of Trivandrum
Most Reverend Edward Mooney, D. D., Archbishop of Detroit
Most Reverend Joseph F. Rummel, S. T. D., Archbishop of New Orleans
Most Reverend Samuel A. Stritch, D.D., Archbishop of Milwaukee
Most Reverend Joseph H. Albers, D.D., J.C.D., Bishop of Lansing
Most Reverend Karl J. Alter, D.D., Bishop of Toledo
Most Reverend Henry Althoff, D. D., Bishop of Belleville
Most Reverend Robert J. Armstrong, D.D., Bishop of Sacramento
Most Reverend Stanislaus V. Bona, D.D., Bishop of Grand Island
Most Reverend Charles F. Buddy, D.D., Bishop of San Diego
Most Reverend Edwin Byrne, D.D., Bishop of San Juan, Porto Rico
Most Reverend Francis P. Carroll, D.D., Bishop of Calgary, Alberta, Canada
Most Reverend Joseph H. Conroy, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Ogdensburg
Most Reverend Stephen J. Donahue, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of New York
Most Reverend Edmond J. Fitzmaurice, D.D., Bishop of Wilmington

Most Reverend John Mark Gannon, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of Erie
Most Reverend Edmund F. Gibbons, D.D., Bishop of Albany
Most Reverend Joseph M. Gilmore, D.D., Bishop of Helena
Most Reverend Richard T. Guilfoyle, D.D., Bishop of Altoona
Most Reverend William J. Hafey, D.D., Bishop of Scranton
Most Reverend Edmond Heelan, D.D., Bishop of Sioux City
Most Reverend Francis W. Howard, D.D., Bishop of Covington
Most Reverend Peter L. Ireton, D.D., Coadjutor Bishop of Richmond
Most Reverend Jules B. Jeanmard, D.D., Bishop of Lafayette
Most Reverend Edward J. Kelly, D.D., Bishop of Boise
Most Reverend Francis M. Kelly, D.D., Bishop of Winona
Most Reverend John J. Lawler, S.T.D., Bishop of Rapid City
Most Reverend Emmanuel Ledvina, D.D., Bishop of Corpus Christi
Most Reverend George L. Leech, D.D., J.C.D., Bishop of Harrisburg
Most Reverend Joseph P. Lynch, D.D., Bishop of Dallas
Most Reverend James A. McFadden, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of Cleveland
Most Reverend Thomas H. McLaughlin, LL.D., S.T.D., Bishop of Paterson
Most Reverend John B. Morris, D.D., Bishop of Little Rock
Most Reverend John F. Noll, D.D., Bishop of Ft. Wayne
Most Reverend Gerald P. O'Hara, D.D., J.U.D., Bishop of Savannah
Most Reverend Thomas M. O'Leary, D.D., Bishop of Springfield
Most Reverend John B. Peterson, D.D., Ph. D., Bishop of Manchester
Most Reverend Paul P. Rhode, D.D., Bishop of Green Bay
Most Reverend Joseph E. Ritter, D.D., Bishop of Indianapolis
Most Reverend Henry P. Rohlman, D.D., Bishop of Davenport
Most Reverend James H. Ryan, S.T.D., Ph.D., Bishop of Omaha
Most Reverend Philip G. Scher, D.D., Bishop of Monterey-Fresno
Most Reverend Paul C. Schulte, D.D., Bishop of Leavenworth
Most Reverend Francis J. Spellman, D.D., LL.D., Auxiliary Bishop of Boston
Most Reverend Francis J. Tief, D.D., Retired, Waterbury, Conn.
Most Reverend Urban J. Vehr, D.D., Bishop of Denver
Most Reverend James E. Walsh, M.M., D.D., Maryknoll, N. Y.
Most Reverend Vincent Wehrle, O.S.B., D.D., Bishop of Bismarck
Most Reverend C. H. Winklemann, D.D., Auxiliary Bishop of St. Louis

Ahern, Rev. Michael J., S.J., Weston College, Weston, Mass.
Ambrose, Sister Mary, O.P., St. Joseph College, Adrian, Mich.
Atonement Seminary, Washington, D. C.
Baldwin, Rev. William J., Barry Square, Hartford, Conn.
Bartholome, Rev. Peter W., St. Mary's Hospital, Rochester, Minn.
Bastnagel, Rev. Clement V., S.T.L., J.C.D., The Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Bauer, Rev. Andrew, O.S.B., Mariah Hill, Ind.
Bengalese Library, Brookland, Washington, D. C.
Bernardina, Sister M., O.P., Dominican Convent, Mission San Jose, Cal.
Berry, Rev. Thomas F., Pio Nono High School, St. Francis, Wis.
Binet, L'Abbe Louis-Leon, ptre, 589 rue Rideau, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada
Bird, Rev. T. E., Evelyn Rd., Sparkhill, Birmingham II, England
Bombach, Rev. Anthony, 881 E. 222nd St., Euclid, O.
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.

Brianceau, Rev. Henry L., S.S., D.D., Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.
Brooklyn Preparatory School, 1150 Carroll St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Bruce, Mr. Frank, 407 E. Michigan St., Milwaukee, Wis.
Bunn, Rev. Edward B., S.J., 4501 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.
Burke, Rev. Leo G., O.M.I., 3 Fayette St., Lowell, Mass.
Bustin, Rev. Dennis J., St. Mark's Rectory, Pittston P. O., Pa.
Cannon, Mr. John D., 407 East Michigan St., Milwaukee, Wis.
Capuchin Fathers, 1927 North 4th St., Milwaukee, Wis.
Capuchin Fathers, Harewood Road, Washington, D. C.
Carmelite College, 1600 Michigan Ave. N. E., Washington, D. C.
Carr, Rev. Kevin, O.S.B., Holy Cross Abbey, Canon City, Colo.
Casey, Rev. Albert M., S.J., M.A., S.T.D., S.S.L., Alma College, Alma, Cal.
Casey, Rev. Maurice J., 1420 Oakhill Ave., Youngstown, O.
Cathedral Book Club, 730 North Wabash St., Chicago, Ill.
Catholic Sisters College, Brookland, Washington, D. C.
Christopher, Rev. Pater, C.P., St. Paul's Retreat, Mt. Argus, Dublin, Ireland
Claudius Antony, Bro., F.S.C., M.A., St. Mary's College of California, St. Mary's College, Cal.
Cleary, Rev. John J., 260 Westchester Ave., Port Chester, N. Y.
Collins, Timothy J., 162 Westminster St., Springfield, Mass.
Conklin, Miss Margaret M., 80 N. Main St., Ansonia, Conn.
Connerton, Rev. Joseph D., 331 East 71st St., Chicago, Ill.
Cottam, Rev. Vincent L., O.M.I., St. Mary of the Lake Church, Bailey's Harbor, Wis.
Cowen, Rev. William E., 15 Clark St., Auburn, N. Y.
Cox, Rev. R. J., C.M., Via Marcantonio Colonna 21A, Rome (33), Italy
Coyle, Miss Eunice S., 1200 16th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Coyne, Rev. A. M., S.J., St. Xavier's High School, Fort, Bombay 1, India
Craig, John J., Box 928, Little Rock, Ark.
Cronin, Rev. James D., 1301 Dolores St., San Francisco, Cal.
Crosier Fathers, Immaculate Conception Monastery, Hastings, Neb.
Cullinan, Rev. John F., 1211 13th St., Altoona, Pa.
Cunningham, Rev. John W., 131 East Wood St., Lowellville, O.
Curran, Rev. John T., S.J., S.T.D., S.S.L., Alma College, Alma, Cal.
Dammann, Mother G. C., College of the Sacred Heart, 133rd & Convent Ave., New York, N. Y.
Demmerle, Rev. George M., 1227 Ansel Road, Cleveland, O.
Demurger, Rev. A., St. Joseph's Infirmary, Hot Springs, Ark.
Derry, Dr. George Hermann, 17609 Woodingham Drive, Detroit, Mich.
De Sales Hall, 907 Michigan Ave., N. E., Washington, D. C.
Discalced Carmelite Fathers, 150 Rhode Island Ave., N. E., Washington, D. C.
Dominic, Mother Mary, Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wis.
Dominican House of Studies, Harlem & Division, River Forest, Ill.
Dominican Novitiate, Amityville, Long Island, N. Y.
Donnelly, John Felon, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.
Doucette, Rev. Lawrence W., All Hallows Rectory, Moosup, Conn.
Dougherty, Rev. John C., S.T.L., 262 West 118th St., New York, N. Y.
Dowed, Rev. Richard A., 77 Broad St., Akron, O.
Doyle, Rev. James E., 331 East 71st St., Chicago, Ill.

Drury, Rev. John L., 18 Pope St., Providence, R. I.
Dubosh, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Francis, 12608 Madison Ave. N. W. Lakewood, O.
Dugan, Rev. Gerald, 1116 West Seventh St., Erie, Pa.
Dugan, Very Rev. Henry, J.C.D., 128 West Georgia St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Dunne, Rt. Rev. Frederic M., O.C.S.O., Trappist, Ky.
Eiringer, Rev. Joseph, 206 Cherry Road, Massillon, O.
Eisenman, Rev. Omer H., St. Mary's Church, North Vernon, Ind.
Esser, Rt. Rev. Ignatius, O.S.B., St. Meinrad's Abbey, St. Meinrad, Ind.
Fallon, Rev. J. C., 222 Orchard Place, Knoxville, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Feehan Memorial Library, St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Mundelein, Ill.
Fenlon, Very Rev. John F., S.S., D.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.
Feyer, Rev. Anthony, 101 S. Mount Street, Baltimore, Md.
FitzGibbon, Rev. Francis X., 75 Greene Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Flanigan, Rev. Michael, 13442 Lorain Ave., Cleveland, O.
Fleming, Very Rev. James T., St. Mary's Seminary, La Porte, Tex.
Foley, Very Rev. Theodosius, O.M.Cap., Provincial, 1740 Mt. Elliott Ave., Detroit, Mich.
Foster, Rev. Richard, S.T.L., Oscott College, Birmingham 23, England
Franciscan Clerics, Oldenburg, Ind.
Franciscan Fathers, Oldenburg, Ind.
Franciscan Fathers, 1362 Monroe St. N. E., Washington, D. C.
Franciscan Monastery, 174 Ramsey St., Paterson, N. J.
Gallagher, Rev. Joseph M., 745 Bryson St., Youngstown, O.
Gallagher, Rev. Owen L., 322 Third St. S. E., Massillon, O.
Gallena, Rt. Rev. William J., 242 North State St., Painesville, O.
Gannon, Rev. R. I., S.J., Fordham University, New York, N. Y.
Georgetown University, Georgetown, Washington, D. C.
Gibbons, Rev. R. P., 10704 Penfield Ave. S. E., Cleveland, O.
Gies, Mr. M. G., 861 Drexel Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
Gildea, Rev. David C., 257 E. Onodaga St., Syracuse, N. Y.
Godin, Rev. Clifford, 2049 Scarth St., Regina, Sask, Canada
Gorman, Rev. Charles D., 5839 Chevy Chase Parkway, Washington, D. C.
Gorman, Rev. Gabriel, C.P., St. Gabriel's Monastery, Brighton, Boston, Mass.
Grace, Staff Sgt. George T., 61st Coast Artillery (AA), Fort Sheridan, Ill.
Graf, Rev. Dom Ernest, O.S.B., Buckfast Abbey, Buckfastleigh, Devonshire, England
Griffin, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Maurice, LL.D., V.F., 13824 Euclid Ave., E. Cleveland, O.
Guyot, Rev. G. H., C.M., S.S.B., S.T.L., St. Vincent's Sanitarium, Wellston Station, St. Louis, Mo.
Habig, Rt. Rev. Msgr. George N., V.F., 614 Cleveland Ave. N. W., Canton, O.
Hafford, Rev. Gabriel W., 802 N. Jackson St., Milwaukee, Wis.
Hanrahan, Rev. Daniel A., Huntington, Long Island, N. Y.
Hanrahan, Rev. Thomas S., 15 Lake St., Webster, Mass.
Haye, Mr. George, 143 Hemlock St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Heenan, Rev. John J., S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
Hermsen, Rev. O. H., West 33rd & Rebecca Sts., Sioux City, Ia.
Heuser, Rev. William, 404 Judiciary St., Aurora, Ind.
Heusler, Very Rev. Basil, O.S.B., R.D., Jasper, Ind.

Higgins, Rev. Martin J., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Hill, Rev. Francis J., O.M.I., 348 Porter Ave., Buffalo, N. Y.
Hogan, Rev. T. F., 1618 Texas St., Houston, Tex.
Holweck, Rev. Francis J., 4019 Gratiot St., St. Louis, Mo.
Holy Cross College Library, Worcester, Mass.
Holy Cross Seminary, W. Lake Road, Dunkirk, N. Y.
Horan, Miss Ellen May, 64 East Lake St., Chicago, Ill.
Houlahan, Rev. F. J., Mount St. Francis, Dubuque, Ia.
Huelsmann, Rev. William H., S.T.L., 4125 Humphrey St., St. Louis, Mo.
Hunt, Miss Marigold (Sheed and Ward), 63 East 8th St., New York, N. Y.
Hurley, Rt. Rev. Joseph, Via Sardegna, Rome, Italy
Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, Ramsey P. O., N. J.
Jeffrey, Rev. G. A., Centre and Chestnut Sts., Freeland, Pa.
Jennings, Rt. Rev. Msgr. G. P., LL.D., 8000 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, O.
Jesuit Fathers, 45 Cooper St., Boston, Mass.
Jesuit Novitiate Library, Jesuit Novitiate, Wernersville, Pa.
John Carroll University, University Heights, Cleveland, O.
Jones, Rev. Alexander, St. Joseph's College, Upholland, Nr. Wiga, England
Keegan, Rt. Rev. Robert F., 477 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.
Kelly, Rev. A. J., St. Joseph's Rectory, Richfield Spa., New York, N. Y.
Kelly, Rev. Thomas J., Collegio dell-Anima, Via della Pace, 20 Rome, Italy
Kennedy, Rev. Philip L., P. O. Box 479, Freeport, Ill.
Kenrick Seminary, 444 Kenrick Road, St. Louis, Mo.
Ketter, Rt. Rev. Frederic, 704 First Ave., Evansville, Ind.
Kinney, Rev. Joseph L., 295 Church St., Hartford, Conn.
Kirby, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward A., S.T.D., 3476 E. 152nd St., Cleveland, O.
Koch, Rt. Rev. Archabbot Alfred, O.S.B., S.T.D., St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pa.
Kraus, Rev. Alex J., Box 1808, San Antonio, Tex.
Krellner, Rev. Justin, O.S.B., S.T.D., St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pa.
Krumholtz, Rev. Robert, S.T.D., Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Norwood, Cincinnati, O.
Ksiazek, Rev. John C., C.R., S.S.L., Box 4484, Washington, D. C.
Kuhn, Very Rev. Andrew B., C.SS.R. Provincial, 526 59th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Lane, Rev. Emmet F., O.M.I., Box 708, Newburgh, N. Y.
Lardner, Very Rev. John J., S.S., D.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.
Lenhart, Rev. John M., O.M.Cap., 220 Thirty-seventh St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Loyola High School, Calvert & Madison Sts., Baltimore Md.
McAleer, Rev. William, 533 Beach 19th St., Far Rockaway, L. I., N. Y.
McCarthy, Rev. C. J., O.M.I., 2026 W. Colorado Ave., Colorado Springs, Colo.
McCarthy, Rev. James F., 305 South Main St., Oconomowoc, Wis.
McCartney, Rev. Joseph, C.S.C., Holy Cross College, Washington, D. C.
McCarty, Rt. Rev. Thomas S., 2417 N. 8th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
McCormick, Rev. John P., S.S., St. Charles College, Catonsville, Md.
McDonough, Rt. Rev. James M., St. Mary's Seminary, Cleveland, O.
McGarey, Very Rev. Michael A., 405 Westinghouse Ave., Wilmerding, Pa.
McGinnity, Rev. James J., 2003 N. Oakland Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.
McGonigal, Rev. Celestine, C.P., 381 West Street, Union City, N. J.

McNanaman, Rev. Edward P., 230 West 10th St., Erie, Pa.
McNamara, Rev. Elmer, S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
McNeill, Rev. Leon A., 307 East Central Ave., Wichita, Kans.
Madden, Rev. John J., 37 South Ocean Ave., Freeport, L. I., N. Y.
Mallon, Rev. Vincent P., M.M., Maryknoll College, Clarks Summit, Pa.
Marique, Rev. Joseph M. F., S.J., St. Ignatius House of Studies, Inisfada, Nanhasset, L. I., N. Y.
Marist College, Washington, D. C.
Marist Fathers, Marist Seminary, Washington, D. C.
Marquette University Library, 1131 W. Wisconsin Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.
Martin, Rt. Rev. Charles A., LL.D., 2007 West 65th St., Cleveland, O.
Martin, Susan, College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York, N. Y.
Maryknoll Seminary Library, Maryknoll, N. Y.
Mayer, Rev. Ferdinand, O.M.C., St. Anthony's Clericate, St. Anthony-on-Hudson, Rensselaer, N. Y.
Mea, Rev. Charles J., Box 234, Prescott, Ontario, Canada
Meier, Rt. Rev. Thomas, O.S.B., Mount Angel Seminary, St. Benedict, Ore.
Merenkow, Rev. B., 2280 West 7th St., Cleveland, O.
Moore, Very Rev. Philip, 810 Chartiers Ave., McKee's Rocks, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Moriarty, Rev. Joseph T., 20930 Lorain Ave., Cleveland, O.
Morris, Rev. H. D., M.S.C., S.T.D., Ph.D., L.S.S., Sacred Heart Monastery, Kesington, N.S.W. Australia
Mt. St. Sepulchre, Box 4500, Washington, D. C.
Mt. St. Vincent, College of, Mt. St. Vincent, N. Y.
Mulasky, Rev. William J., 4930 Montview Blvd., Denver, Colo.
Mulligan, Rev. Thomas P., 4309 East 131st St., Cleveland, O.
Mullin, Rev. Francis, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
Murphy, Rt. Rev. George F., S.T.D., 4129 Superior Ave., Cleveland, O.
Nazareth College, Nazareth, Mich.
New Subiaco Abbey, Subiaco, Ark.
Niemann, Rt. Rev. Henry F., 507 South 10th St., St. Joseph, Mo.
Norbertine Fathers, 920 Christian St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Notre Dame of Md. College Library, Charles Street Extension, Baltimore, Md.
Novitiate of the Sacred Heart, Novaliches, Caloocan, Rizal, P. I.
Nunan, Rt. Rev. James J., D.D., V.G., Cathedral, St. Augustine, Fla.
Oblate Fathers, Essex, N. Y.
Oblate Fathers, 159 Moore St., Lowell, Mass.
Oblate Fathers, 725 Merrimack St., Lowell, Mass.
Oblate Fathers, 1707 North 49th St., Seattle, Wash.
Oblate Fathers, 2210 Robinwood Ave., Toledo, O.
Oblate Novitiate, Tewksbury, Mass.
Oblates of Mary Immaculate, 300 Grand St., Ligonier, Ind.
O'Brien, Marcus, St. Vincent Seminary, Latrobe, Pa.
O'Connor, Rev. William R., St. Joseph's Seminary, Yonkers, N. Y.
O'Donohoe, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph G., LL.D., St. Mary's Church, Sherman, Tex.
O'Donnell, Rev. Joseph, Via della Sagrestia 17, Città del Vaticano
Ohleyer, Rev. Leo, O.F.M., S.T.D., 3140 Meramec St., St. Louis, Mo.

O'Keefe, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph S., V.F., 715 Coburn St., Akron, O.
O'Reilly, Mr. John L., North American College, Via dell-Humilta, Rome, Italy
Passionist Fathers, 178th St. & Wexford Terr., Jamaica, N. Y.
Patterson, Rev. Michael J., 20141 Detroit Ave., Rocky River, O.
Peebles, Mr. Bernard M., 1306 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, Mass.
Petrie, Rev. Capistran, O.F.M., 135 West 31st St., New York City, N. Y.
Pfundstein, Rev. Adam, Atlantic & Washington Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Ready, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael J., 2400 19th St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
Reardon, Rev. Francis A., 4108 West Eighth St., Cincinnati, O.
Redemptorist Fathers, 389 E. 150th St., Bronx, New York, N. Y.
Redemptorist Fathers, 3112 Seventh St. N. E., Washington, D. C.
Regulski, Rev. John, St. Hugh's Rectory, Huntington Station, L. I., N. Y.
Reilly, Rev. F. P., 4019 N. Farrell Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.
Reinl, Rev. A. J., Catholic Rectory, Elkhart Lake, Wis.
Reintges, Rev. William, C.SS.R., 1118 N. Grand Blvd., St. Louis, Mo.
Roach, Rev. John F., St. Stephen's Church, Niles, O.
Rubicky, Rev. Martin B., 460 Reed St., Clairton, Pa.
Ruffini, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Ernesto, Piazza S. Ufficio, Rome, Italy
Russel, Rev, William H., Ph.D., The Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Ryan, Rev. Christopher, S.S.L., St. Patrick's College, Thurles, Ireland
Rybinski, Rev. Joseph, D.D., St. Cyril & Methodius Seminary, Orchard Lake, Mich.
Sacred Hearts Seminary, Sargent Road, N. E., Box 4463, Washington, D. C.
Sadlier, Mr. Francis X., 825 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.
St. Andrew-on-the-Hudson, St. Andrew-on-the-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
St. Ann's Passionist Monastery, 1239 St. Ann St., Scranton, Pa.
St. Anthony Clericate, St. Anthony-on-the-Hudson, Rensselaer, N. Y.
St. Anthony's Monastery, Butler, N. J.
St. Augustine's Seminary, Kingston Road, Toronto, Canada
St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kans.
St. Bernard Abbey, St. Bernard P. O., Ala.
St. Bernard's Seminary, P. O. Box 929, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.
St. Bernard's Seminary Library, 2260 Lake Avenue, Rochester, N. Y.
Saint Cyr, Rev. A. W., O.M.I., 716 Middlesex St., Lowell, Mass.
St. Gregory's College, Shawnee, Okla.
St. Ignatius Rectory, 980 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.
St. Joseph's Abbey, St. Benedict, La.
St. Joseph's College, 18th & Thompson Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
St. Joseph's College House Library, 18th & Thompson Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.
St. Joseph's Monastery, 783 East North Hampton St., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
St. Joseph's Passionist Monastery, 3800 Frederick Ave., Baltimore, Md.
St. Jude's Seminary, Claretian Fathers, Momence, Ill.
St. Louis Preparatory Seminary, 444 Kenrick Road, St. Louis, Mo.
St. Mary's College, Faculty Library, St. Mary's, Kans.
St. Mary's College, Theologians' Library, St. Mary's, Kans.
St. Mary's Monastery, Dunkirk, N. Y.
St. Mary's Seminary, 1227 Ansel Road, Cleveland, O.
St. Mary's Seminary, 5440 Moeller Ave., Norwood, O.
St. Mary's Seminary Library, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.

St. Meinrad Alumni Association, St. Meinrad Seminary, St. Meinrad, Ind.
St. Norbert College, 103 Grant St., West De Pere, Wis.
St. Patrick's Seminary Library, Menlo Park, Cal.
St. Paul's Monastery, Monastery St., Pittsburgh, Pa.
St. Paul Seminary Library, St. Paul, Minn.
St. Peter's Rectory, 144 Grand St., Jersey City, N. J.
St. Stephen's Monastery, Croghan, N. Y.
St. Thomas Seminary Library, 1300 South Steele St., Denver, Colo.
St. Xavier College, 4938 Cottage Grove Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Salesia, Sister M., O.S.B., Convent of Immaculate Conception, Ferdinand, Ind.
Salzmann Library, St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wis.
Saum, Rev. G. B., 418 N. Wabash Ave., Evansville, Ind.
Scecina, Rev. Thomas, 126 West Georgia St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Schmitt, Rev. Albert H., P. O. Box 176, George West, Tex.
Schmitz, Rev. John W., 204 6th St., Barberton, O.
Schmucker, Rev. Thomas A., C.M., S.T.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Perryville, Mo.
Schultz, Rev. Theodore J., Craft Place, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Seminary of the Immaculate Conception (2), Huntington, N. Y.
Seminary of the Immaculate Conception, The Mission Society, Huntington, L. I., N. Y.
Seter, Rev. Michael P., 600 East Virginia St., Evansville, Ind.
Shadowbrook, The Librarian, Lenox, Mass.
Shea, Rev. T. F., Assumption Rectory, 25 No. Cliff St., Ansonia, Conn.
Shields, Rev. Francis R., Box 431, Sutersville, Pa.
Shields, Rev. John, 549 Hunter St., Turtle Creek, Pa.
Sisters College, 1027 Superior Ave. N. E., Cleveland, O.
Sloane, Rev. Charles O'Conor, 460 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.
Smith, Rev. Ernest J., 77 Broad St., Akron, O.
Smith, Rev. Gregory F., 2419 East 5th St., Denver, Colo.
Smith, Rev. Leo R., 50 Franklin St., Buffalo, N. Y.
Smith, Mr. William C. (Benziger Bros.), 12-14 W. 3rd St., New York, N. Y.
Sorg, Rev. Rembert, O.S.B., S.T.L., Ph.D., St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pa.
Stevens, Helen P. (Mrs. John), 56 Mott St., Ansonia, Conn.
Sulpician Fathers, St. Joseph's College, Mountain View, Calif.
Tamisier, Rev. R., Grand Seminaire, de Rodez, Aveyron
Thorpe, Rev. Wiliam, 4427 Rocky River Drive, Cleveland, O.
Tierney, Very Rev. M. D., 3126 Benton Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo.
Tintle, Rev. Angelus, O.F.M., 1060 11th St., Denver, Colo.
Towell, Rev. Stephen, S.T.D., 1862 Noble Road, East Cleveland, O.
Trainor, Very Rev. Joseph N., V.F., 150 W. Wood St., Youngstown, O.
Tralka, Rev. Anthony, 39 East 22nd St., Bayonne, N. J.
Treacy, Rt. Rev. Msgr. John P., 612 N. B. C. Building, Cleveland, O.
Trible, Rev. Joseph G., Star Route, Oldenburg, Ind.
Trinity College Library, Trinity College, Washington, D. C.
Ujlaki, Rev. John, O.S.B., S.T.D., St. Vincent Archabbey, Latrobe, Pa.
Ursuline College for Women, 2234 Overlook Rd., Cleveland, O.
Vaitkevicius, Rev. Josephus, M.I.C., Marian Hills Seminary, Hinsdale, Ill.
Varley, Rev. Joseph D., Paynesville, Minn.

Villanova College, The Library, Villanova, Pa.
Walsh, Very Rev. Leonard, O.F.M., Mt. St. Sepulchre Box 4500, Washington, D. C.
Ward, Rev. Stephen A., 408 Tioga St., Johnstown, Pa.
Weinlich, Rev. Alfred J., 66-25 79th Place, Middle Village, L. I., N. Y.
Weisengoff, Rev. P., S.T.L., S.S.L., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
West Baden College, West Baden Springs, Ind.
Wheeler, Rev. Thomas J., 2849 Brendan Ave., Baltimore, Md.
White, Rev. Thomas A., 279 East 17th St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wicke, Rev. A. G., 315 N. E. 3rd St., Washington, Ind.
Wildermann, C., Co., 33 Barclay St., New York, N. Y.
Wourms, Mr. John H., Wallace, Idaho
Xavier University, Washington and Pine Sts., New Orleans, La.
Ziegler, Rev. A., S.T.D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Zonca, Rev. Norbert, St. Hyacinth's Seminary, Granby, Mass.

ACTIVE MEMBERS

Arbez, Rev. Edward P., S.S., M.A., S.T.D., Sulpician Seminary, Washington, D. C.
Ballou, Rev. Benedict H., O.F.M., M.A., St. Bonaventure's Seminary, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.
Bandas, Rev. Rudolph G., Ph.D.Agg., S.T.D., S.T.M., St. Paul's Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.
Barry, Rev. William T., C.SS.R., S.S.L., Mt. St. Alphonsus, Esopus, N. Y.
Bellwald, Rev. August, S.M., S.T.D., Marist College, Brookland, D. C.
Bolduc, Rev. Thomas U., S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L., Notre Dame Seminary, S. Carrollton Ave., New Orleans, La.
Botz, Rev. Paschal R., O.S.B., S.T.D., St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minn.
Braun, Rev. Wendelin M., O.F.M.C., Watchbell St., Rye, Sussex, England
Brennan, Rev. Silvan James, C.P., 178th St. & Wexford Terrace, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y.
Britt, Rev. Matthew, O.S.B., St. Martin's College, Lacey, Washington
Byrne, Rev. Edward J., Ph.D., S.T.D., St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.
Callan, Very Rev. Charles J., O.P., S.T.M., Litt.D., Manhatten Ave., Hawthorne, N. Y.
Cerny, Rev. Edward A., S.S., A.B., S.T.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.
Coleran, Rev. James E., S.J., A.M., S.T.D., S.S.L., Weston College, Weston, Mass.
Collins, Rev. John J., S.J., M.A., S.S.L., Weston College, Weston, Mass.
Considine, Rev. J. S., O.P., S.T.Lr., Dominican House of Studies, River Forest, Ill.
Costa, Rev. Aloysius M., O.F.M., A.M., S.T.D., St. Francis Seraphic Seminary, W. Andover (Lowell P. O.) Mass.
Costello, Rev. Charles, O.M.I., S.T.D., 391 Michigan Ave., Washington, D. C.
Cotter, Rev. Anthony C., S.J., Weston College, Weston, Mass.
Crossland, Rev. Edward F., B.A., S.T.D., S.S.B., Collegio Teutonico, Via della Sagrestia, Vatican City, Rome, Italy

Cummins, Rev. Patrick, O.S.B., S.T.D., Conception Abbey, Conception, Mo.
Deegan, Rev. Harry T., C.M., M. A., St. Joseph's College, Princeton, N. J.
De Vine, Rev. Charles F., C.SS.R., S.S.L., St. Alphonsus Seminary, Woodstock, Ont., Canada
Dillon, Rev. Henry, Ph.D., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Mary's Seminary, La Porte, Tex.
Dirksen, Rev. Aloys H., C.PP.S., S.T.D., St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, Ind.
Dobell, Rev. Richard, M.A., St. Augustine's Seminary, Toronto, Ont., Canada
Donzé, Rev. Edward, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L., Marist College, Washington, D. C.
Dougherty, Rev. John J., S.T.L., S.S.L., Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, N. J.
Dowd, Rev. William A., S.J., M.A., S.T.D., St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, Ill.
Doyle, Rev. John, Ph.D., Marian College, Indianapolis, Ind.
Ehrhardt, Rev. Philip J., O.M.I., Ph.D., S.T.D., S.S.L., De Mazenod Scholasticate, San Antonio, Tex.
Flynn, Rev. Leo, A.B., S.T.L., S.S.L., St. Peter's Seminary, London, Ont., Canada
Foerster, Rev. Raymond J. L., C.P., St. Gabriel's Monastery, Brighton, Mass.
Foley, Rev. Leo P., C.M., S.T.D., Kenrick Seminary, Webster Groves, Mo.
Friedel, Rev. Lawrence M., S.V.D., St. Augustine's Seminary, Bay St. Louis, Miss.
Furfey, Rev. Paul Hanley, Ph.D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Garant, Rev. Charles Omer, L.Ph., S.T.D., S.S.L., Laval University, Quebec Canada
Gaul, Rev. Cyril, O.S.B., M.A., St. Meinrad's Seminary, St. Meinrad, Ind.
Georges, Rev. Norbert, O.P., S.T.L., Harlem Ave., River Forest, Ill.
Grimmelsman, Rt. Rev. Henry J., S.T.D., Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, O.
Gruenthaner, Rev. Michael J., S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D., St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Kans.
Gumbinger, Rev. Cuthbert, O.M.Cap., S.T.D., Glenclyffe, Garrison, N. Y.
Hald, Rev. Henry M., A.M., Ph.D., 94-32 118th St., Morris Park, L. I., N. Y.
Hanley, Rev. John G., A.B., St. Peter's Church, Trenton, Ont., Canada
Hartman, Rev. Louis, C.SS.R., S.S.L., Ling.Or.L., Mt. St. Alphonsus, Esopus, N. Y.
Hertvik, Rev. Wenceslaus, O.M.C., S.T.D., Our Lady of Carey Seminary, Carey, O.
Heupler, Rev. Charles G., O.M.Cap., S.T.L., Capuchin College, Washington, D. C.
Hodous, Rev. Edward J., S.J., M.A., Ph.D., S.T.D., S.S.D., Carroll and W. 30th Sts., Cleveland, O.
Hofer, Rev. Maurice, S.S.L., Pontifical College Josephinum, Worthington, O.
Keenan, Rev. Francis L., S.T.D., St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.
Kennedy, Rev. Mark, O.F.M., M.A., S.S.Lr.G., Holy Name College, Washington, D. C.
Kronlage, Rev. Camillus, C.P., Sacred Heart Retreat, Louisville, Ky.
Kugelman, Rev. Richard, C.P., S.T.L., S.S.L., St. Mary's Monastery, Dunkirk, N. Y.

LeBuffe, Rev. Francis P., S.J., Ph.D., 30 W. 16th St., New York, N. Y.
Leddy, Rev. Francis J., C.M., S.T.D., Niagara University P. O., N. Y.
LeHoullier, Rev. Alban, O.M.I., Ph.D., S.T.D., Oblate College, So. Natick, Mass.
Lilly, Rev. Joseph, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Thomas Seminary, Denver, Colo.
Loechte, Rev. Augustine, S.V.D., Ph.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Techny, Ill.
Lyons, Rev. Damian B., O.F.M., S.T.L., Old Mission, Santa Barbara, Cal.
McAndrews, Rev. Myles M., S.S., M.A., S.T.D., St. Patrick's Seminary, Menlo Park, Cal.
McClellan, Rev. William H., S.J., M.A., S.T.L., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
McConnell, Rev. John F., M.M., S.T.L., S.S.L., Via Sardegna, 83, Rome, Italy
McGarry, Rev. William J., S.J., Ph.D., S.T.D., S.S.L., Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
McGlinchey, Rev. James M., C.M., S.T.L., 500 E. Chelten Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
McGlynn, Rev. Francis, C.S.Sp., B.A., S.T.D., Ferndale, Norwalk, Conn.
McGolrick, Rev. Anthony, Regina Cleri Seminary, Regina, Sask., Canada
McGuire, Rev. Cyril N., O.F.M., St. Stephen's Monastery, Croghan, N. Y.
McHugh, Very Rev. John A., O.P., S.T.M., Litt.D., Manhatten Ave., Hawthorne, N. Y.
McMahon, Very Rev. Arthur L., O.P., S.T.M., 487 Michigan Ave. N. E., Washington, D. C.
Mahan, Rev. George S., S.J., Weston College, Weston, Mass.
Mahoney, Rt. Rev. Andrew P., D.P., V.G., St. Peter's Seminary, London, Ont., Canada
Maloney, Rev. Augustine M., O.S.A., Augustinian College, Washington, D. C.
Mangan, Rev. Edward, C.SS.R., S.S.L., Immaculate Conception Seminary, Oconomowoc, Wis.
Matulich, Rev. Silvano G., O.F.M., M.A., Old Mission, Santa Barbara, Cal.
Meyer, Rev. Albert G., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Francis Seminary, St. Francis, Wis.
Mollaun, Rev. Romuald, O.F.M., S.T.D., Franciscan Monastery, Oldenburg, Ind.
Monahan, Rev. Timothy A., O.F.M., S.T.D., St. Stephen's Friary, 414 E. 82nd St., New York, N. Y.
Murphy, Rev. Bede, C.P., Sacred Heart Retreat, Louisville, Ky.
Murray, Rev. John J., S.T.L., St. Lawrence Rectory, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Newton, Rev. William L., M.A., S.S.D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
Peirce, Rev. Francis X., S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
Pelletier, Rev. Georges-Leon, Ph.L., S.T.D., S.S.L., Laval University, Quebec, Canada
Peters, Rev. Edward, C.S.P., S.T.D., 118 Via Venti Settembre, Rome, Italy
Pickar, Rev. Charles H., O.S.A., A.B., S.T.L., S.S.L., Augustinian College, Washington, D. C.
Plassmann, Very Rev. Thomas, O.F.M., M.A., Ph.D., S.T.D., LL.D., Litt.D., St. Bonaventure College, St. Bonaventure, N. Y.

Poulet, Rev. Donat, O.M.I., L.Ph., A.B., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Joseph's Scholasticate, Ottawa, Canada

Power, Rev. Albert, S.J., Corpus Christi College, Werribee, Victoria, Australia

Rehwinkel, Rev. C., O.F.M., St. Joseph's Seminary, Teutopolis, Ill.

Reilly, Rev. Thomas A'K., O.P., S.T.L., S.S.L., Oakland Ave. & Boston Blvd., Detroit, Mich.

Reilly, Rev. Wendell S., S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D., St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

Rowan, Rev. John F., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

Ryder, Rev. T. F., C.S.P., St. Paul's College, Washington, D. C.

Sanders, Rev. Edwin D., S.J., M.A., S.T.D., S.S.B., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

Schumacher, Rev. Joseph H., (Deceased) St. Vincent's Infirmary, Little Rock, Ark.

Seraphin, Rev. Eugene W., O.F.M., St. Stephan's Monastery, Croghan, N. Y.

Sheehan, Rev. J. B., O.P., St. Joseph's Priory, Somerset, O.

Shine, Rev. William A., M.A., S.T.D., St. Gregory's Seminary, Cincinnati, O.

Siegman, Rev. Edward F., C.PP.S., S.T.L., St. Charles Seminary, Carthagena, O.

Skehan, Rev. Patrick W., S.T.D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Smyth, Rev. Kevin, O.M.Cap., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Anthony's Monastery, Marathon, Wis.

Stapleton, Rev. Matthew, A.B., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. John's Seminary, Brighton, Mass.

Stegmann, Rev. Basil A., O.S.B., S.T.D., St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minn.

Steinmueller, Rev. John E., S.T.D., S.S.L., Seminary of the Immaculate Conception, Huntington, L. I., N. Y.

Stenz, Rev. John B., S.T.D., S.S.L., 217 W. Fourth St., Dayton, O.

Stoll, Rev. Raymond F., S.T.D., Mt. St. Mary's Seminary, Norwood, Cincinnati, O.

Sullivan, Rev. Thomas, C.P., 178th St. & Wexford Terrace, P. O. Box 24, Jamaica, N. Y.

Sweeney, Rev. Gabriel, C.P., Norwood Park, Chicago, Ill.

Temple, Rev. Patrick J., S.T.D., 7 State St., New York, N. Y.

Tennant, Joseph J., S.T.D., S.S.L., Immaculate Conception Seminary, Huntington, L. I., N. Y.

Thibodeau, Rev. Wilfrid J., S.S.S., S.T.D., 17608 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, O.

Tibesar, Rev. Norbert, O.S.B., S.T.D., St. Bede College, Peru, Ill.

Tierney, Rt. Rev. John J., A.M., D.D., Mt. St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, Md.

Waible, Rev. Albert H., C.SS.R., S.S.B., Mt. St. Alphonsus, Esopus, N. Y.

Walsh, Rev. Francis A., O.S.B., Ph.D., Litt.D., (Deceased) St. Anselm's Priory, Washington, D. C.

Yungfleisch, Rev. Simon, C.P., 3800 Frederick Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Ziskovsky, Rev. George, Ph.D., S.T.D., S.S.L., St. Paul's Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

BOOK REVIEWS

GEORGE O'NEILL, S. J., *The World's Classic, Job* (Milwaukee, The Bruce Publishing Co., 1938). Pp. XIII, 158. $2.75.

The many translations and commentaries of the Book of Job, made throughout the centuries, are by themselves a proof that there is in this ancient piece of sacred literature a subject-matter which has a grip on the mind and heart of humanity and a treatment of the subject such as has made it indeed worthy of the title, given to it: "The World's Classic." The new version of the book by Father O'Neill, of Corpus Christi College, Melbourne, Australia, affords further evidence that this title is fitting.

This new edition consists of an original translation, preceded by a lengthy introduction and accompanied by brief notes. The introduction, intended for the general reading-public, deals with the ordinary topics of text, authorship, date of composition, literary character, and teaching in an informal but sufficiently informing manner.

Rejecting the theory of a Babylonian source for the inspired book, Fr. O'Neill holds that, while its scene of action is laid outside the boundaries of the Jewish world and the disputants are free from the restrictions which Jewish law and customs might have imposed upon them, the author was a Jew, having perfect command of the Hebrew language. On the question of the date of his writing, the opinion which places it between the time of Solomon and the Captivity is favored. While the hero of the poem is held to have been a real historic personage and his misfortunes real events, the book concerning him is recognized to have "many of the characteristics of a parable and of a poem." "The misfortunes of Job and his demeanour as a sufferer may have been long traditional among the long-memoried peoples of the half-desert region along the eastern borders of Palestine." But,

> the celestial scenes of the Prologue are evidently symbolical, presenting in picturesque and dramatic form the part taken in the calamities of the righteous by Divine Providence, by evil angels, and by man good and evil. Earthly incidents are reported with a symmetry, which tells of literary art rather than of historic precisions. The long speeches in verse that accompany the book represent obviously idealized, not actual conversations. Artistic ordinance is everywhere discernible.

The problems concerning the literary unity of the book are treated at considerable length but in a manner intelligible to the general reader. The main difficulty concerning the authenticity of the Prologue and the Epilogue is met by the suggestion that the inspired author "took a pre-existing prologue and epilogue—for the matter of the Book of Job was, no doubt, traditional—and made it the framework and shrine of his original speculation on the great questions,

which interested him." But our author regards the necessity of this explanation as doubtful.

Regarding the problem of the genuineness of the Elihu speeches, Fr. O'Neill considers the opinion that they are an addition by an inspired writer, later than the author of the rest of the book, as supported by "some not-negligible arguments." He notes, however, that Budde and others defend the authenticity of these speeches.

Chapter 27, the hymn in praise of Wisdom, is held to have perhaps been an originally independent composition—but the writing of the author of the rest of the work—inserted by him into his poem "in no sequence of thought but at the point that seemed to him least inappropriate—very much in the manner, in fact, of the interludes in a Greek tragedy."

In certain parts of the book, particularly in connection with Chapters 25–28 and 40, "it seems almost impossible to suppose that the text is rightly ordered as it stands; and exegetes seem to be growing unanimous as to the evidence of displacements arising from scribal errors—errors that must, of course, be ascribed to a very early period of the Book's long history."

The text, used by Fr. O'Neill as the basis of his translation, is ordinarily the Massoretic Hebrew. Judiciously conservative, he nevertheless oftentimes abandons the traditional reading in favor of well-founded emendations of textual critics and for readings of the Septuagint and of the Latin Versions. The difficult task of translating the text—St. Jerome himself found it difficult and elusive "like an eel or a snake"—is done with clearness and elegance. From a literary standpoint by itself Fr. O'Neill's translation is a delight to read. The justification which he gives in the notes concerning the eclectic critical text, which he has adopted, adds to the pleasure.

The difficulties, presented by the subject-matter of the book, are graphically summarized by our author.

> The eternal conflict between good and evil; the right interpretation of this conflict, of its bewildering vicissitudes and baffling consequences, the difficulties in a distracted and suffering world of maintaining faith in a Creator and Ruler who is wise, loving and omnipotent, of equating rewards and punishments, either in this mortal life or in a dimly described future, with men's good or evil conduct—these are problems over which from the beginning of time the thinker has tormented his brain and the ordinary man has brooded in bewilderment or anguish. Over them high debate surges to and fro in this Book among five protagonists—Job, his three friends, the suddenly appearing Elihu, and finally the Almighty Himself.

Everyone knows of course of the great patience of Job. Not so well known is his remarkable impatience toward God, which forms one of the chief doctrinal difficulties of the poem. Fr. O'Neill quotes a modern as saying: "Job enjoyed the most magnificent grumble in human

records"; but explains the sufferer's eloquent arraignment of the habitual course of human affairs by calling attention primarily to the vehemence of the language of feeling being among Orientals far greater than among modern Westerners, and then to the fact, attested by Denis the Carthusian, that "men who are enduring intense pain often speak very strongly rather as an outburst of feeling than as a deliberate expression of thought. And so it happens that God, the searcher of hearts, sometimes is actually pleased by such utterances while they sound ill in the ears of men." The praise, which God is represented toward the close of the poem as having bestowed upon Job for having spoken far more wisely than his seemingly orthodox friends, and the reward or, as St. James expresses it, "the end which the Lord gave to him," are undoubtedly to be considered in the light of the theological viewpoint of the time. Job was angry concerning God and His ways because he could not find Him to be such as he conceived God should be. Nevertheless Job would not abandon the search or struggle; he would suffer, as he served God, for nothing; and thus, after all, faith prevails. And his faithful suffering served to raise Job to a nobler theology and higher hopes than he or his friends had known before.

It is not licit for us to judge the utterances of Job merely by the norms of Jewish, and still less of Christian perfection. With the scene laid outside the limits of the Jewish world, the disputants are hardly to be judged by the standards which Jewish doctrine would have imposed upon them. Even in popular Hebrew thought there existed a faulty and dangerous accentuation of the possession of temporal and earthly prosperity as a sign and sanction of righteousness. In the matter of retribution in a future state, the groundwork of Christian hope and constancy—the resurrection of the body and everlasting life with God—

> The Hebrews, strong in their doctrine of One God, the sole Creator and Lord, did not stand out quite as conspicuously above their heathen neighbours. In the light vouchsafed to them regarding a future state of life we notice, however, the greater clearness that marks the latest books of the Old Testament.... A higher and happier conception (of the state of the dead) is caught momentarily by Job; his four human interlocutors have scarcely a glimpse of it; the Almighty makes no reference to it; nay, seems to shut it out of sight by His insistence on the marvels of nature and by the promptitude and abundance of earthly reward with which He meets Job's merits.

Fr. O'Neill's treatment of the difficult passage (19:25-27), is not as full or as satisfactory as it might be. He accepts the reading of the Massoretic Hebrew as the original inspired text of the passage. He retains the traditional translation "redeemer" for the Hebrew word גֹּאֲלִי, although he recognizes that the Douay-Rheims translation "Re-

deemer," by which the Latin Vulgate "redemptor" has commonly been translated, "suggests in Job a clearness of prophetic messianic vision which there is no reason to ascribe to him. What he is thinking about is this; one day after his death God will take his part effectively against his calumniators and enemies." It would seem therefore that, even though the word גֹּאֵל may actually have the meaning of "redeemer," its significance according to Fr. O'Neill's view would be better rendered by the word "vindicator."

Fr. O'Neill's translation of the following verses seems to place him among those who see in the passage an expectation on the part of Job of the resurrection of his body after death. "Here for the first time the gloomy doctrine of Sheol is magnificently transcended." He notes that "the whole passage has been accepted by Christian tradition as a recognition of Divine judgment after death and a prophecy of the Gospel doctrine of the Resurrection." It would have been well for him to have mentioned the opinion of some Catholic scholars, Ceuppens, Szczygiel, and others, that the supreme hope and conviction, expressed by Job in these verses, was to see *before* his death God Himself appear to confound the insolences of his friends and to vindicate his claims to innocence. This latter interpretation has the support of 42:5 ff., the meaning of which is undisputed.

It is not impossible, writes Fr. O'Neill, to discern providential bearings in the gradual discipline and slow enlightenment of the Hebrew people regarding a future state of life. Of strongly material imagination in their religious ideas, "carnal and stiff-necked" according to the denunciations of their own prophets, they were undoubtedly better preserved by a scheme of earthly rewards and punishments from the idolatry out of which they had with difficulty been drawn than they would have been by a greater stress of the more exalted doctrines of retribution beyond the grave. The fact was never lost sight of that there must certainly be some retribution for the individual who had, or who had not, lived up to his religious ideals. But the Christian clear conception of heaven and hell, purgatory and "limbo" were still wanting, even though definite retribution or some sort of intense life after death, are referred to in various places of the Old Testament and are at times forcibly asserted.

The Book of Job marks a notable stage of progress in doctrine; but even within its chapters there are varying degrees of vision. "It is clear," concludes Fr. O'Neill,

> the problems of good and evil, of reward and punishment are not approached by Job and his friends as they would be approached and (within human limitations) solved by the voices of the New Testament. "Une grande esperance a traversé la terre"; and its light has transfigured the Christian

Saint, still a wayfarer on earth, into something incomparably more luminous than his forerunner of the Old Testament.

Fr. O'Neill's edition is a praiseworthy presentation in a new English form of this ancient sacred classic of the world's literature. Its Introduction and Notes will be helpful to the general reader; those who have been puzzled by the obscurity of some of the passages of the Book according to the Douay-Rheims Version will keenly appreciate its admirable translation.

EDWARD J. BYRNE.

EMILE MERSCH, S. J., *The Whole Christ.* Translated by John R. Kelly, S. J. (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1938). Pp. XVI, 623. $5.00.

This reviewer is happy to use the opportunity given him of saluting with unstinted praise the magnificent work of Father Mersch and the true, precise, and very capable translation of Father Kelly. The book is decidedly a precious addition to Catholic literature and should remain for a number of years a principal source of reference for the Catholic scholar. Undoubtedly it will become a Catholic classic. And yet the matter is so digested and so simply and clearly written that it may be read with untold profit by anyone.

The purpose of the author was not to build up a theological-philosophical system to explain the meaning and the diverse ramifications and consequences of the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, but to trace the development of that doctrine through Holy Scripture and Tradition up to the present status of the beautiful teaching to-day. It would seem a rather easy task at first sight, but when one reads the book and realizes the patient and painstaking labor entailed not only in the mere gathering of the material but especially in the choice of the citations, one must necessarily conclude that the task was a mammoth one. That the author remained faithful to his purpose throughout the work is in itself worthy of the very highest commendation. The result has been that he has produced a very store-house of information and has drawn a remarkably clear and true picture of the development of the doctrine from the beginning to the present day.

The author has divided his book into three almost equal parts: Part One, The Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Sacred Scripture; Part Two, The Doctrine of the Mystical Body in the Greek Fathers; Part Three, The Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Western Tradition. He has been so apt in his choice of citations that this reviewer believes a re-quoting of some of them will tell you more about the author's work than the reviewer's own words would do.

Before quoting any passages from the Old Testament the author warns his readers that light must be shed on the Old Testament from the New. Then, after quoting a few pertinent passages from St. Paul,

particularly from Ephesians, the author says: "Now with the aid of those rays of light which we have discovered, it remains for us to see how the Old Testament actually does speak of Christ, and how it represents that union which even then God was preparing to establish between man and Himself in His well-beloved Son." Then by a selection of passages which are very apt he shows how the Old Testament, by a series of figures in which Israel is called God's people, God's flock, God's beloved, the Spouse of God, God's son, God's first-born, teaches us that God formed a kind of solidarity with Israel, a clear foreshadowing of the close union of mankind with the Son of God. "This solidarity," says the author, "is not to be something purely extrinsic. Israel is like unto Yahweh because he is His son. As Yahweh is a God different from all others, or rather, as He is the only God, and holy, so too Israel is a nation apart." And then comes the citation from Leviticus: "I am the Lord your God; be holy because I am holy. Defile not your souls by any creeping thing, that moveth upon the earth. For I am the Lord, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, that I might be your God. You shall be holy, because I am holy."

Of the Gospels he says in general: "The special formation of the Gospels (he does not include St. John) explains the manner in which they speak of the Mystical Body. They do not treat of it directly; directly they speak only of Christ. But the Christ they describe is not a Christ imprisoned within the narrow limits of His brief appearance on the stage of this world; He is a Christ who, in his very historical life, is also mystical."

Each of the Gospels shows this in its own way according to the author. Mark makes the central theme of his Gospel the death of Christ. This death marks the disappearance of the historical Jesus; yet it appears to be the principal part of the story. Jesus came in order to die.

There is a like orientation in St. Matthew and St. Luke. This apparently paradoxical orientation is divested of its paradoxical character when interpreted in the light of the Mystical Body. "Christ," says our author, "has a twofold life on earth; one visible and historical, the other invisible and mystical; the first is the preparation for the second, and the second is the prolongation of the first."

"The passage which sums up the entire Gospel from the standpoint of the doctrine of the Mystical Body is that which serves as the conclusion of the narative." These are the words of the author at the end of his analysis of St. Matthew, and then he quotes the passage: "All power in heaven and on earth hath been given me. Go ye therefore, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to

observe all that I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all days, unto the consummation of the world." This is quoted by the author from the Westminster Version. This passage is but the résumé of a teaching which is expressed in several passages in the three synoptic Gospels.

In regard to the Acts of the Apostles the author has this to say: "The fact that the Gospel of St. Luke is an introduction and a beginning shows us that in order to understand clearly his teaching on the subject of the Mystical Body, we must look for that teaching primarily in the Acts.... It was the mission of St. Matthew, we may say, to present the doctrine of the Kingdom at greater length; it remained for St. Luke to show what the Kingdom is, and how it is the mystical continuation of Christ." The author beautifully calls the following text the description of the birth of the Mystical Body: "There came a noise from heaven as of the rushing of a blast of wind, which filled the whole house where they were seated. And there appeared to them tongues as though of fire, which parted and sat upon every one of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit." Finally, Father Mersch's remark on the conversion of St. Paul sums up this thought on the development during the time of the Acts of the Apostles: "The Head and the members are one; therefore, since he has been conquered by the Saviour, the Apostle of the Nations now belongs to the Christians."

"Saul, Saul why persecutest thou me?" These words cleft into the very marrow of St. Paul's soul. They resounded in his ears at every step. They explain his devotion to the teaching of the doctrine of the Mystical Body.

Father Mersch is at his best when analyzing St. Paul's teaching. To introduce the new section where he treats of St. Paul and St. John, the author says: "As to the intimate nature of this union (with Christ) and of this Kingdom, God has until now spoken only in very summary fashion. This he tells us in the Epistles of St. Paul and, in in a somewhat different way, in the writings of St. John." A little later he goes on to say concerning St. Paul: "We have seen in studying the Acts, that Paul had received the revelation of Christ living in the Church. Now he transmits this revelation to the Church." I think the following will sufficiently portray Father Mersch's analysis of St. Paul's contribution to the development of the doctrine of the Mystical Body. Speaking of St. Paul's love for Christ the author says: "There is more here than a preference, more than an obsession. It is a presence. Not only is Paul in love with Christ; he possesses Christ. His Christ is not simply a man who has died and happens to find himself alive again; He is a man who gives life to all other men. The doctrine of the Mystical Christ takes on an entirely new emphasis in

the Apostle's writings; it gives his Epistles their individuality, and we may say with St. John Chrysostom that in all his writings, Paul is intent upon one thing: to show the faithful that they possess all things in common with Christ." Rightly and thoroughly understood, this is the essence of what we might call "Paulinism."

The author's explanation of St. Paul's favorite expression "in Christ" is surely one of the high-lights of this section of the book. After quoting Ephesians 1:3-13 where the expression or its equivalents "in Him" or "in His beloved Son" occur nine times, Father Mersch says:

> The meaning is obvious. There is question of a supernatural inclusion in the Saviour; all mankind, and even the whole universe, is summed up and included, as it were, in Him. Only in Him does God see it and bless it. But God sees things as they are. Hence Paul means that by the operation of Grace we are truly plunged, truly incorporated into Christ. This real and mystical inwardness is the full sense, the technical sense, so to speak, of the formula "in Christ."

Only a fear of making the review unnecessarily long forces me reluctantly to omit other quotations. I finish this section of the criticism with another quotation from the author:

> We may say in general that the resurrection does not enter, at least primarily, into the doctrine of the "mystery" and of the life "in Christo," whether we consider the descriptions of the complex organism which is the Mystical Body or the expressions in which Paul tells us that this organism is so truly one as to constitute a single man, one Christ.... The essential, ultimate and complete explanation of the resurrection, of its mystical efficacy, and of all that is mystical in the Saviour, lies in the fact that the Saviour is God. This is why Paul's teaching can be strictly theocentric without being any less Christocentric; for if Christ is the center of all in man, God is the center of all in Christ.

This quotation brings us quite naturally and logically to the section where St. John's contribution is discussed. In the very beginning of his inquiry Father Mersch says: "At the same time new light is shed upon the doctrine of our union with Christ. This light comes even in the greater clearness given to the other points of faith, for John makes this truth (union with Christ) the focal point of Christian doctrine." This statement is not a mere theory which Father Mersch sets out to prove. It is clear from the numerous quotations which he cites from St. John. St. John's teaching is not new, it is a continuation. "His writings, the last in date of the inspired books, were to continue what the others had begun, give the finishing touches to the whole, and set the final seal upon the system." St. John's place in God's plan and wish to reveal the beautiful doctrine is well expressed by the author of our books in these words:

In the Old Testament, we recall, God had foretold the union which He planned to form with men. How Christ accomplished this union is shown in the Synoptic Gospels, and Paul tells us in what it consists. There now remains only the task of synthesizing the two aspects, of explaining that the unity of which the Apostle speaks, the Mystical Christ who incorporates all the faithful in Himself, is none other than that Jesus of Nazareth whose deeds and words are recorded by the Synoptics. This synthesis is furnished us by the beloved disciple: such, in the logical order, is the position of his teaching on the subject of the Mystical Body.

"Always," says our author, "John has only one chief purpose, but this purpose extends to a second: to speak of the God Christ, and in speaking of Him, to speak of us, who in Him, are animated with a divine life." And so in the very beginning of the Gospel Father Mersch finds a beautiful passage to quote: "Full of grace and truth. For of His fullness we have all received, and grace on grace; for the Law was given through Moses, grace and truth come through Jesus Christ."

One other quotation will suffice to see how deeply the author has penetrated into the thought of St. John and therefore into the thought of Christ, very truth itself. As a little commentary on the scene with Nicodemus, Father Mersch says:

> One can hear the whisper of the spring breeze. But it comes from unexpected sources and passes on to unknown regions; of its action we can know only what we experience in the little corner where we are. But this very real breeze is also a symbol. It represents a life whose immensity transcends even space and time. Into this life we are plunged at our rebirth, and all we know of it is the tiny spot where we are grafted onto eternity.

Let this suffice. I am sure the readers of this review will be convinced from even this inadequate attempt to show what masterly work Father Mersch has done in his analysis of the scriptural development of the "mystery," that the book *The Whole Christ* is indeed worthy of highest praise and of diligent reading and even of profound study. His section on Tradition is just as equally scholarly, and throughout, his determination to avoid theorizing and simply to present evidence of development is simply amazing.

In only one section, the chapter devoted to the Synoptics, he is perhaps (I say "perhaps" designedly) a little prone to draw conclusions not wholly founded on his premises. And if I should criticize further I would say the Reverend translator, Father Kelly, had done better if he had quoted the New Testament according to the current Douay-Rheims version as he did the Old Testament. In no passage quoted, is the Westminster more correct or clearer than the more familiar and perhaps better authorized Douay-Rheims.

EDWARD A. MANGAN, C. SS. R.

MOST REVEREND ALBAN GOODIER, S. J., *Witnesses to Christ.* Studies in the Gospels (London: Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1938). Pp. 164. $2.25.

The Most Rev. author has admirably succeeded in illustrating the positive truth of the Gospels in as far as it touches upon the person of Christ. *Witnesses to Christ* contains twelve Studies; of these four have appeared in current magazines; another was read before the More Society, London. Each Study is a unit and complete in itself. Combined they tell us of the person and the nature of Christ, the outstanding characteristics of His teaching and the traits of His personality; we have here a summation of His life and work.

The Witness of St. John the Evangelist concerning Christ is a reverie of the past occasioned by the subtleties of philosophic discovery. St. John knew but one Word: the eternal Word, the Word made flesh. Men had rejected It; he would declare It. One then accompanies St. John as he recounts the life of the Master. We see how the succession of incidents gradually unfolded to St. John truth and light, the true nature of the Logos. He permits us to see how this knowledge was born in his mind, how it blossomed into conviction. There is no controversy, no apologetics. Simple and clear statements impart to the reader something of the conviction the Evangelist experienced.

Very similar in treatment is *The Witness of the Twelve* concerning Christ. The Twelve were drawn toward Christ, captivated by His personality; they were invited to follow Him without a demonstration of His power. The miracles He performed for them were to strengthen their belief, to prove beyond a doubt His fidelity and worth. In time one of the Twelve understood; then, all. At first they spoke of Him as the "Messias"; then as "Him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets did write, Jesus the son of Joseph of Nazareth"; later came their avowed recognition, "Rabbi, Thou art the Son of God, the King of Israel"; finally St. Peter in the name of the Twelve confessed, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God."

Delightfully interesting are the two Studies *The Witness of Nazareth* and *The Witness of Galilee.* The author's facile pen whisks one to the hillsides and valleys, the meadows and workshops in and about Nazareth. These scenes are reconstructed for the greater part from impressions and associations deduced from the teaching and preaching of Christ. The student of Christ's life, theologian or layman, will find in these Studies a spark of fire to increase his love and admiration for the Master, to stimulate his efforts still further in behalf of Him.

Witnesses to Christ is an acquisition to any theological library; it should grace the list of required reading in seminaries where such a custom obtains. References to biblical citations are ordinarily noted in but three of the Studies; in some Studies the references are quite

clear to one acquainted with the Bible; still, one feels that many priests, seminarians, and certainly the members of study clubs would appreciate a constant notation of biblical citations.

CHARLES G. HEUPLER, O.M.CAP.

E. SERAPHIN, O. F. M., and J. KELLY, O. F. M., *Maps of the Land of Christ* (Paterson, N. J.: St. Anthony's Guild, 1938). $1.50.

This book will be heartily welcomed by all teachers, retreat-masters, and students of the New Testament. Each period of the life of Christ, from the Nativity to the Passion and Resurrection, is illustrated by a distinctive map. These maps are simple, clear, and have a pleasing color composition. On the page, opposite to each, there is a list of events connected with the period delineated, together with the distances traversed by Christ, expressed in miles. Particularly acceptable are the maps relating to Holy Week, Calvary, Nazareth, Bethlehem, and Jerusalem. The second part of the book records the miracles of Christ, His apparitions, parables, similitudes, and allegories, giving the place and the principal lesson to be drawn from each.

Unfortunately there are some minor blemishes. Haran was not in the land of Chanaan, nor was Lot killed (p. 2). Chanaanite does not mean zealot; the similar word, alluded to in Mark, 3:18, is derived from quite a different root. "Amorrhites" does not signify "mountaineers," but denotes the inhabitants of Amurru, the region west of the Euphrates. The number of the Israelites leaving Egypt was not 600,000; this was the number of the men capable of bearing arms. Besides, this number is suspect. The enumeration of the peoples in the Promised Land is incomplete (p. 4). Hevites does not mean "villagers" (p. 2). Horeb and Sinai are names of one and the same mountain (p. 5). Mt. Hebal and Sichem should be placed in Ephraim (p. 7). It is untrue that the stronger tribes were placed on the border to protect the weaker (p. 6). There is no river es-Saba, nor does any large river rise in the vicinity of Hebron. Callirhoe is not a river but a place; it is not an Arabic but a Greek word, meaning "beautifully flowing" (p. 61). The "Palace of Herod" should be named "Hasmonaean Palace," and the "Citadel of Herod" should be called "Palace of Herod" (p. 29). The climate of Palestine is not tropical (p. 49). En-Nasira does not signify "Flower" in Arabic; it is merely an Arabic rendering of the Hebrew, which may mean "It sprouts." Nazareth was not mostly inhabited by Samaritans, but was completely Jewish down to about the fourth century A. D. (p. 44). Mt. Sion was not on the western hill, but must be identified with Jebus, the old city (pp. 40, 60). It was only in later times that the whole city was called Sion. Sion does not mean "sunny," but "dry place" (p. 60). Philistia is not derived from "palash," but from "Pulasatu," the name of the

Philistines, which is non-Semitic (p. 49). The "waters of Merom" (Jos. 11:5) cannot be identified with Lake Huleh. Hermon most probably does not mean "lofty," but "sacred place." Moria cannot mean "given by God" but probably signifies "God causes to see." Et-Tur cannot mean "holiness" but simply denotes "the mountain." Hence Tur Sina merely means "The mountain of Sina." Sinai cannot mean "pointed" but probably signifies "the region of Sin" (the moongod). El-Kelt is not a Hebrew but an Arabic word; it is not the brook of Carith (pp. 59, 60, 61). The interpretations of Aaron, Ebal, Tabor, and Garizim are uncertain. In a future edition we should like to see a reference to the Pool of Bezetha and explanations of such vitally important names as Moses, Elias, Jesus, Mary, Elizabeth, Zachary, John, Peter, etc.

M. J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

RAND MCNALLY & CO., *Historical Atlas of the Holy Land* (1938). $1.00.

This atlas will be highly appreciated by students of both the Old and the New Testament on account of the abundant and generally accurate information which it provides. Important names stand out prominently and thus are easy to find; the coloring of the maps is subdued so that geographical details are not obscured. Special maps are devoted to each of the great world empires which held sway over Palestine in Biblical times, and to most of the important periods of Hebrew history. A long series of maps depicts the kingdom of Herod, the life of Christ, the journeys of the Apostles, especially those of St. Paul, the important cities of the New Testament, the isles of Greece and the Seven Churches. In addition there is a physical map of Palestine and one of modern Palestine. Battle sites, Levitical cities, and cities of refuge are indicated by special devices.

Despite the labor and care lavished upon this atlas, it could be improved in some points. The map picturing the descendants of Noah has a number of inaccuracies. The empire assigned to Ramses II is fantastically large. Under the maps of the Assyrian and the Persian empires, the approximate year should be given when they had their maximum extent as indicated on the charts. The territory of the Assyrian empire is too small. The usefulness of this atlas would be much increased if the following maps were added: the Tell Amarna age, period of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Machabean age, the time of Pompey and Mark Antony. Horeb and Sinai should not be represented as two mountains.

M. J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

RIGHT REVEREND JOSEPH DEAN, D. D., *The New Testament*, Westminster Version. Vol. I, The Synoptic Gospels (Second Edition, Revised, New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1939). Pp. XXVII, 383. $4.50.

The present volume needs no introduction to Catholic English-speaking students and scholars who have followed with interest the work of the Westminster translators. Begun in 1913 and completed in 1935, the Westminster Version of the New Testament first appeared in eleven separate volumes. Since its completion, "The Synoptic Gospels" have been re-edited separately. But with the publication of this work the set is now complete in four volumes. The present volume presents the text of the previous second edition together with an Introduction to each Gospel, and two appendices: The Chronology and Harmony of the Life of Christ, and the Synoptic Problem.

Whether or not one agrees in every instance with the translator, it must be confessed that Monsignor Dean manifests a thorough knowledge of the Greek text, and the ability to render the sacred text clearly and attractively. Above all, the abundant footnotes provide for a better understanding of the text. However, the price of this single volume will perhaps prohibit its wider circulation. Therefore, it is hoped that in the near future the Editors will provide a single volume for the entire text of the New Testament.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

H. FRANKE, *The Salvation of the Nations*, Preface by Karl Adam (London: George Coldwell, Ltd., 1938). Pp. VIII, 142. 4s.

This little book is timely. Exaggerated doctrines on race and nationality are being justly condemned on all sides. Hence a brief, but scholarly and clear, exposition of the place of nationalism in the Mystical Body of Christ is to be welcomed. Drawing largely on St. Ambrose's concept of "salus publica" the author proves that Christ died for nations (*gentes*) and peoples (*populi*) as well as for individuals. On page 53 Franke gives the underlying fact of his thesis:

> As man in his natural life is not only an individual but also, and essentially, a social being; as it is only as "nation" that he experiences the complete reality of human existence; so in the supernatural order of life a region is opened up for the Christian which transcends the purely personal, disclosing vistas which in isolation he could never enjoy.

All nations, in a certain sense, receive a preparation for the acceptance of Christ. They may also be "elect," accepting Christ and becoming a *plebs sancta*, bringing to, and receiving from the Mystical Body definite gifts. Public (national) service of God is a duty of such nations. For those nations who reject Christ the last chapter of the book is a warning. For the author demonstrates there

that nations as well as indivduals will be subject to the final judgment of God.

Though one may question whether all the texts which Franke adduces from Scripture, the Fathers, and the liturgy refer clearly to "nation" as we conceive it today, still the author's thesis is solid.

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of these may be reviewed in subsequent issues.)

St. Anthony's Guild, Paterson, N. J.:

Maps of the Land of Christ. By EUGENE SERAPHIN and JEROME A. KELLY. 1938. Pp. VI, 62. $1.50.

Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago, Ill.:

Historical Atlas of the Holy Land. 1938. $1.00.

Longmans, Green & Co., New York:

The New Testament. Westminster Version. Vol. I. The Synoptic Gospels. By the RIGHT REV. MONSIGNOR JOSEPH DEAN, D. D., PH. D. (Second Edition Revised). 1939. Pp. XXVII, 383. $4.50.

Burns Oates, & Washbourne, Ltd., London, England:

The Gospel of Jesus Christ. Vol. II. By PERE M. J. LAGRANGE, O. P. Translated by members of the English Dominican Province. 1938. Pp. VIII, 350. 10s. 6d.

"Our Hope" Publication Office, New York, N. Y.:

The Hope of the Ages. By ARNO CLEMENS GAEBELEIN, D. D. 1938. Pp. 187. $1.00.

Macmillan Company, New York, N. Y.:

Did Christ Really Live? By H. G. WOOD. 1938. Pp. $1.75.

The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, Pa.:

The Pharisees: The Sociological Background of Their Faith. 2 Vols. By LOUIS FINKELSTEIN. Pp. 793. $5.00.

Holy Scriptures with Commentary: Deuteronomy. By JOSEPH REIDER. 1937.

Behrman's Jewish Book House, New York, N. Y.:

What we mean by Religion. A Modern Interpretation of the Sabbath and Festivals. By IRA EISENSTEIN. 1938. Pp. XIV, 145. $1.25.

P. J. Kennedy & Sons, New York, N. Y.:

The True Vine and its Branches. By EDWARD LEEN, C. S. SP. 1938. Pp. X, 268. $2.50.

Fortuny's Publishers, New York, N. Y.:

Spiritual Potencies. By FRANK S. TOLMAN, PH. D., and MARY W. TOLMAN, A. B. 1939. Pp. 151. $2.00.

The Antiquities Corporation, Chicago, Ill.:

The World's Oldest Writings. By HENRY JAMES REYNOLDS, M. D. 1938. Pp. XVIII, 328. $4.95.

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.:

The Strophic Structure of Hebrew Poetry. As illustrated in the first book of the Psalter. By CHARLES FRANKLIN KRAFT. 1938. Pp. III, 117. $1.00.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Cincinnati, Ohio:

The Book of Psalms. A Commentary by SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, D. D. 1938. Pp. XIII, 414. $2.50.